

C Y R I L    L U C A R I S :

H i s   L i f e   a n d   W o r k

. . . . .

By

G. A. Hadjiantoniou



## P R E F A C E

. . .

Cyril Lucaris was a great Greek, one of the greatest in modern Greek history. He lived in a very interesting time - a sad period in the history of his country. A period of slavery and decline for the Greek people, during which the Church of Rome, on the one hand, was making a successful attempt to make up for its losses in the West, by invading the Greek East, and England and France, on the other hand, were struggling for supremacy in the Near East. At such a time Lucaris attempted a great work for his own people, in which cause he was called to suffer much and ultimately to lay down his life.

The above sets ~~the limits~~ to the present thesis its limits. It has a triple aim. This is : To draw a picture of Lucaris, as a man, as this picture can be reconstructed from his own correspondence and from ~~his~~ testimonies of people who knew him. To set that picture against the historical background of Lucaris' own time, and in order to do this I have been obliged to make use of material, which has not always a direct bearing on the life-story of Lucaris. And, finally, to unfold the work which Lucaris attempted to do for his people, assess its real and lasting value and account for the comparative paucity of its results.

. . . . .

## C o n t e n t s

. . . . .

Early Years	I
Mission to Poland	24
Patriarch of Alexandria	36
On the Ecumenical Throne	51
Beginning of Troubles	65
"In Perils from my own Countrymen...."	75
The "Congregatio" gets angry	86
A Printing-house is set up in Constantinople	95
"Confessio Fidei"	III
More attacks by fellow-countrymen	I30
The Two Cyrils	I45
The Martyrdom	I56
Achievements and Assessments	I68
Bibliography	I80

## Chapter 1.

### E A R L Y   Y E A R S.

- - - - -

He was only a boy of twelve when in 1584 he arrived at Venice, (1) and that was the first time he had gone so far away from home. Many days and many nights he spent on the ship, before there rose suddenly before his eyes out of the sea, as if by magic, the city of the Lagoons. And what a world that was into which he stepped! What a contrast to the poor, homely environment of his own little town in far off Crete, with its winding cobbled streets, its humble houses, its gardens and orchards, and an occasional stray goat finding its way onto its streets. How different from the great, noisy city, with its stately buildings, and its big squares, and its watery lanes.

Probably little Constantine Lucaris went to lodge at the 'Salvatico', or at the 'Leon Bianco', or at some other of the famous and flourishing hotels of the city. For at a time when travelling in Italy was a rather risky affair for foreigners, who happened to hold religious views other than those approved by Rome, Venice had flung her gates open, and a continuous stream of travellers were coming in and going out of her canals. But he was not left long in the hotel, for, almost at the same time with him another Greek had come to Venice, who was quite famous in his time, and he took the little Cretan boy under his protection. Maximos Margunios (2) had already been consecrated as bishop of the island of Cythera, off the southern coast of Greece, but for some reason the Venetian authorities of the island would not permit him to land there and exercise the duties of his



office. So Margunios betook himself to Venice, which was already well known to him from the years of his youth, when he had succeeded in spending there the whole of a goodly paternal inheritance, in his vain effort to set up a Greek printing-house in the city. Here therefore he came to stay until such a time as the permission would be granted to him to go and settle in his island See. And it was fortunate for young Constantine Lucaris that he arrived at Venice at the time of Margunios' self-exile there. For though the latter had one or two queer ideas, which had occasionally landed him into hot water, and on one occasion had brought him within sight of a Roman prison, he was an excellent man - a man of great culture and of an upright character. He was a little of a poet too - his "Anacreontian Hymns" (3) having attained the glory of repeated editions. He was steeped in classical studies, as one can gather from his letters, which are written in a style of irreproachable classical correctness. But besides the cultured mind, old Margunios had a warm human heart too, and now and then that heart could break through the hedges of classical correctness, and forget itself in the more homely "Demotic" idiom, as when, in one of his letters to his young protégé, he so far departed from his classical standards, as to actually call him "My lad Constantine".(4) Such a grievous lapse, however, could only occur in connection with one whom he loved, and for that young compatriot of his - for he too hailed from Crete - he had conceived a real love.

It was by that man that Constantine was taught his Greek, his Latin, and his Italian, and under him he took his first steps in Philosophy. It is moving to see in the letters which teacher and pupil exchanged on their occasional partings, the paternal care with which the old man was following the studies of the boy, and the pride which he felt over his progress.

In one of his letters he commends his pupil for the beautiful expressions he had used in one of his own, and although he is obliged to remark that unfortunately the handwriting was not equally beautiful, he expresses the hope that since the greater gift was given him, the lesser one would follow in time.(5) To judge from Lucaris' manuscripts which have come down to us, the wish of his old teacher was left unfulfilled. Margunios' love for his pupil was returned to him in a rich measure. Constantine came to love him as a second father, and it seems that this love was the recognition of something greater than the teaching of Latin and Greek, for Margunios somewhere calls the young boy "his son in Christ".(6) At any rate the influence which the teacher exercised on the mind of the pupil was great and manifold. In more than one respect he had become the ideal, which the young boy had set himself to copy. Constantine even affected the peculiar style of his teacher, for after he had parted with him, one of his friends writes to tell him that he detected a "Margunizing" tendency in his letters.(7) So it was through Margunios' window that Constantine had his first glimpse of Venice.

Of course if he had meant to see Venice in the height of her glory, he had arrived about a hundred years too late. Gone were the days when the Republic was the clearing-house of the world. Gone were the days when six commercial fleets were equipped and manned every year, with the corresponding caravans, and were dispatched as far as Russia, and Siam, and India in the East, as far as Spain and the British Isles in the West. The three hundred odd cargo-boats, of which the fleets were composed, carried the flag of St. Mark proudly on all the sea-lanes to bring back to Venice the merchandise of distant countries, and so long as the Republic's hand held firmly the monopoly of the world's commerce, the riches which flooded her was something fabulous. To all

this, however, a young Portuguese sailor had long ago put an end. The year 1497 saw Vasco da Gama rounding the Cape of Good Hope, and a new route - a water passage - was discovered to the Indies and the East. A passage which was free from the heavy expenses of the caravans, and from the taxations which were imposed by the cities that lay on their route, and from the troublesome and expensive interruptions of the journey caused by the passing of the cargo from ship to caravan, and from caravan to ship. It was not long before the new route became popular, and Venice found herself suddenly outside the avenues which the commerce began to follow. Priuli(8) records in his Chronicle what a heavy blow the Venetians felt it to be when the news of the new discovery reached their city: "When this news reached Venice, the whole city felt it greatly, and remained stupefied, and the wisest held it as the worst news which could ever come."

So young Constantine missed the zenith, but he saw a beautiful sunset. In the lands of the Mediterranean the name of Venice was still great and the legend of her riches still alive. Long after Lucaris' day, many a young Greek mother sang her little one to sleep by reassuring her that she had ordered

".....In Venice her wardrobe,  
And her jewellery."

The day of the great Republic was not yet over, and those closing hours were lived up to the glorious past. Constantine would be sure on Ascension Day to witness that beautiful ceremony of the "Espousals" of the Doge with the Sea. An English writer (9) who happened to visit Venice shortly after Lucaris had been there, has left us a description of that remarkable rite. The "Bucentaur" a triumphal galley, richly gilt, brought the Doge with the "Clarissimoes" of the "Signiory" out into the open, with every available boat in Venice following

in its train. When the galley reached a certain point, the Doge with all solemnity threw into the sea a ring - the nuptial pledge of its subjection to Venice. The custom had its origin in the days of Pope Alexander III, and was scrupulously observed long after it had lost its meaning. In recognition of the services which the Venetian fleet had rendered him, the Pope offered to the Doge a golden ring, and commanded him to cast it into the sea. "This ceremony, he told him, shall on this day be yearly observed both by thee and by thy successors, that posterity may know how you have purchased the dominion of the sea by your valour, and made it subject unto thee, as a wife to her husband." The matrimonial faith, alas, had long ago been sadly broken, but the mystical ring was yearly cast into the sea with all the pomp and the splendour of the old good days.

And yet in some sense Lucaris was fortunate to have come to Venice in those days of her decline, for it was then that her beauty reached its maturity.(10) The less her income grew, the more lavishly she spent it on her palaces and churches, and her pageants. As the little Cretan boy wandered in the streets of the great city, he must have stopped <sup>before</sup> many a beautiful house-front, decorated by a Titian or a Tintoretto or a Veronese. He entered the stately churches and stood admiringly before their mosaics. He walked to the Piazza di Rialto, and saw the important-looking patricians walking under the famous colonnade and discussing politics. He saw the women wearing their silks and velvets, covered with precious stones, and tottering on their richly ornamented "Zoccoli", those strange clogs, with heels so high that they had to lean on the shoulders of their servants, lest they fall. He saw the city, half-asleep in day-time, suddenly waking up in the evening for another night of revelry. He listened to her laughter and her song. "They sang in the squares, in the streets, on the canals; the shopkeepers sang as they



sold their wares; the workmen sang as they left their work; the gondolier sang while he waited for his master." He saw all this - and he also saw the great immorality of the city. That was by no means a period of high moral standards, especially in Italy; yet many an Italian town would be shocked by the excesses of Venice. How different all this - the noisy streets and the laughing canals - from the dear little town which the young boy had left behind!

There was another sense in which Lucaris<sup>had</sup> arrived too late at Venice - and that was even more important for him. When, roaming about the city, he came to the Piazzetta, near the Grand Canal, he would come across the great library where was deposited the valuable collection of Greek manuscripts, which was bequeathed to the city by the Greek Cardinal Bessarion. And very near there he would be shown the building where the press of Manucio Aldus used to turn out the Greek classics in fine editions, and where the famous Aldine Academy used to meet. That would remind him that not too long ago Venice had been "par excellence" the centre of Hellenic studies. But now that too was more or less a matter of the past. The century which was now drawing to its close witnessed great changes. That had been an era of discoveries and inventions, which opened before the human mind horizons far wider than it had ever known, and people were no longer content to take their knowledge second-hand from the Greeks and the Latins. And thus it was that the century which had opened with a flourishing of the classical studies, was now closing in on a rapid decline of those studies.

Yet it was not a very distant past, and even its memory would make itself felt on young Lucaris. Men like George of Trebizond, who not so very long ago was teaching Greek in Venice, and the two Apostolios, father and son, who linked their names with the first Greek editions in that city, and

John Lascaris, that cultured ambassador of the King of France in Venice, who had thrown his rich library open to the scholars of that city, and the Cretan Demetrios Ducas, who had seen a good many Greek books out of the Venetian press, before he proceeded to Spain to assist the Cardinal Ximenes in the publication of the first Polyglot Bible at Alcala, and Demetrios Zenos, who had come from Zante to distinguish himself in the translation of the classics, and later was entrusted by Francis I of France with the education of his son Henry, and Contoleon the copyist, and those two other Cretans, Zacharias Allierghis and Nicolaos Blastos, who had given, the first his industry, the second his money, to found a Greek printing-house in Venice, and enriched the world of books with some beautiful editions, and above all the great Mark Mussuros, that wise and learned man, once again a son of Crete, who proved himself to be Aldus's right hand in His valuable editions of the Greek classics, and who before proceeding to Padua to occupy the chair of Greek had made Venice, to use Aldus's own expression, a "second Athens"(11) - men like these are not easily forgotten, and Constantine must have been a proud boy walking about in a city so full of memories of this kind. Why, it was not more than ten years since Theotokopoulos had completed his studies under Titian and had left Venice for Spain, to win for himself as "El Greco" a name among the world's great painters.

Nay, even Aldus, himself an Italian, was at heart a Greek. On that volume of Aristoteles which ~~was~~ in his hands while yet in Crete, Lucaris would have noticed that little phrase on the front page, "This book was printed in Venice, in the house of Aldus Manutius, a Roman and a Lover of Greece." It is doubtful whether Greece ever had a lover more ardent and more noble than Aldus. His printing-house was itself a little Greek colony. From the instructions to the workmen which are preserved for us in Greek, we understand that the majority of them were Greeks, a good proportion of them from the island

of Crete. And the same is true of the other printing-house in Venice, the one founded by Blastos and Callierghis, a fact which gave to Mark Mussuros the proud occasion of composing that delightful little poem which we find printed at the beginning of the "Etymologicum Magnum" - (12)

"But why should I wonder at the spirit of the Cretans, for it was Minerva herself, who, at the command of her father, instructed them in the beauties of art! It was a Cretan who chiselled the stamp; it was a Cretan who stringed together the pieces of brass; it was a Cretan who pricked them; it was a Cretan who melted the lead. A Cretan met the expense, and it is a Cretan who is writing these verses...."

But to come back to Aldus, the Academy which he founded was no less a witness to his love of Greece than his printing house. Indeed, the Academy was born in the printing-house. It was formed by the scholars whom Aldus had gathered around him to help him with the preparation of his editions. Some of them were so enthusiastic for the new Greek learning, that they "hellenized" their Italian names, like the Secretary of the Academy, the scholar Fortiguerra, who now became Carteromachus. The love of those men for the Greek language was such, that in the Statutory Law of the Academy, which was written in Greek, (13) it was laid down that its members could only use in their conversations with each other the Greek language, and in case someone forgot and spoke in another language, he would pay a fine, and every time he lapsed the fine would be repeated. The money thus collected would be placed in a box, and at a certain time the box would be opened and if the money contained therein were sufficient, Aldus would stand the members of the Academy a dinner, "a grand one, and not one fit only for printers." Unfortunately the annals of the Academy do not tell us how many such meals the Academicians had enjoyed.



All this, however, was now a matter of the past. Aldus died, and not long after both the printing-house and the Academy were buried with him. And the other printing-house, that of Blastos and Callierghi, in the hard times that followed the League of Cambrai, was obliged to move to Rome, where thanks to the encouragement received from Pope Leo X. it survived for a little longer. Now, so far as Venice was concerned, all that noble Greek activity was ended, and if young Constantine had suddenly the desire to hear the sound of his native tongue, outside his own house, he would either have to go for a hair-cut, as most barbers in Venice were at that time Greeks, and their shops were among the most popular centres of local gossip, or else he would have to search out one of the shops where the famous Greek wine, so popular among the Venetians of the time, was on sale. A rather far cry from the times of Aldus and Mussuros!

Aldus passed away, but he did not do so before he created a tradition, and that tradition was to reassert itself on Lucaris' career in days to come. On more than one occasion Aldus and his books proved to be a stumbling block in the good relations between Rome and Venice. The Venetians were very proud of their growing commerce of books; Rome, however, was not very enthusiastic about it. The authorities of the "Index" had again and again the occasion to intervene and place the products of the Venetian press on the prohibited lists.(14) And this only served to increase the friction which already existed between Venice and Rome. Venetians had always had the outlook of a merchant. And though they claimed to be good Catholics, they were very careful not to permit the demands of the Church to override their commercial interests. They were fond of saying: "Siamo Veneziani, poi Christiani" ("We are first of all Venetians, and then Christians")(15), and all along their history they held themselves true to that maxim. At a time when the bonfires of ~~the~~

the Inquisition were claiming their victims by the hundred in other countries of Europe, Venice resisted the establishment of the Holy Office on her soil. She was too good a merchant not to realize that personal security and security of one's property are indispensable for commercial enterprise, and she thus avoided copying the mistake of Spain, who let herself be bled white by the Inquisitors. When at last Venice was obliged to admit that institution in her territory, she placed it under a strict civic control, so that it became quite innocuous. The archives of the Venetian Holy Office have only six cases to show of people who were put to death for their religious convictions.(16) Thus St. Mark kept St. Peter at a safe distance, and the result was that there reigned in Venice a freedom of thought and a spirit of independence, which were undreamt of at that time in any other city of Italy. As someone has put it, "Freedom of thought was at that time a refugee in Venice."(17) It was in that city of freedom that young Lucaris spent the first formative years of his youth, and we may not be far wrong if we say that in the proud spirit of independence which he exhibited all through his life, and the deep antipathy which the papal claims of authority always raised in his heart, one can recognize the first impressions which he received in the freedom-loving Republic of the Lagoons.

Did Lucaris get anything more from Venice, apart from his Greek and Latin and his sense of personal independence, which was to stand him in such a good stead in years to come? It is doubtful. Venice was one of the most important centres in Italy, in which the Reformed doctrines were cultivated within the Roman Church itself. A lively branch of the "Oratory of Divine Love" was operating in that city. That famous book "On the benefits bestowed by Christ", which though written by a devout Catholic was publicly burnt in Rome, had circulated widely in Venice, and the doctrine of justification by faith had been taught there by many, otherwise loyal, children of the Church. It is true

that that movement belongs to a time somewhat earlier than the arrival of Lucaris in Venice, but it could not have died out completely, and it is possible that it was in Venice that Lucaris heard for the first time of those doctrines, which he was to adopt and defend in later years. If that is the case, however, we find no trace of it in his letters. If young Constantine heard of those doctrines in Venice, he either heartily disliked them, or else he found them too deep for him and ignored them. It is more likely that his first real acquaintance with the Reformed Faith must be placed at a later time. For the time being he is quite content with lesser things - Latin and Greek. His old dream is now at last being fulfilled, and he wants nothing better; his cup is running over.

-O-            -O-            -O-

But the dream came suddenly to an end. It was probably financial difficulties which forced his parents to call him back at the end of four years, and with a heavy heart Constantine bade farewell to his beloved Venice and to the old teacher and set sail for his native island. However sorry he may have been to leave Venice behind, his heart must have leapt within him when, from the deck of the ship he recognized in the distance the familiar outline of the snow-capped Psiloritis, the famous Ida of the ancients,

"In pitch rich above other,  
Of oaks the pregnant mother."(18)

A short time after Lucaris made that journey to Crete, an Englishman a certain Thomas Dallam was travelling from England to Constantinople bringing to the Sultan a present from Queen Elizabeth. The ship passed very near Crete, and Master Dallam records in his Diary that a passenger on board the ship, a Jew, told him that at the top of that high mountain which they saw towering up from the centre of the Island, there stood a brazen man, who was holding in his hand a bow, which he kept bent as if he were shooting against the East.(19

The story of that Jewish passenger was very probably some folk-tale, which was current at that time, and it must have had its origin in the ancient Greek story of the brazen giant Talus, the son of Vulcan, who walked daily thrice around the whole island keeping watch over its coasts. However that may have been, the story was a fit emblem of the spirit of the Cretan people at that time. In those melancholy years which followed the Fall of Constantinople, when it seemed as if Greece had gone to sleep, and its history is a sad record of intellectual and moral decline, a small flame of the Hellenic spirit was kept alive in Crete. It has well been said that at that time Crete was the "Little Hellas". Like another Tallus she was keeping her watch, waiting patiently for the dawn.

At that time Crete was a Venetian colony. She had been such for nearly four hundred years, and the Venetians did not find it by any means a colony easy to hold. The first one hundred and fifty years of Venetian occupation were marked by an obstinate and unequal struggle of the hardy Greek islanders against the proud Mistress of the Seas. That stubborn struggle of the Cretans, which made such a sharp contrast to the passive spirit with which the rest of Greece resigned herself to her fate, was something that the Venetians could not understand, and they probably explained it, as it has been suggested, by attributing to the Cretans a double dose of original sin. However that may have been, the truth is that the Hellenic spirit of freedom survived on the mountains of Crete longer than in any other part of Greece.(20) And even when the Cretans, utterly exhausted, were forced to calm down, it was only after to some extent, they had conquered their conquerors. Like the Roman conquerors of Greece, the Venetian masters of Crete were allowed to settle down and enjoy their conquest only after they had been considerably "hellenized". In the countryside the absorption of the Venetians by the Greeks was complete. There the Venetian colonists adopted the Greek language, the Greek customs, and even the Greek religion, their only link with the past being their sonorous names



of Dandolos, Cornaros, Venieris, etc. One very rarely saw a Latin monk or priest in the countryside. In the cities, however, the Venetian element managed to keep its head above the water, and it was there that the bishops of the ten Sees of the Island had sought refuge, together with a host of priests and monks of the Franciscan, Dominican and Augustinian orders, who did not dare to go out to the villages and fulfil their mission.(21)

But the spirit of independence is as a rule a costly thing. And the statistics of the population of the Island at that time bears witness to this. When the Venetians came to Crete, its population amounted to 500 or 600 thousand, and by the time young Lucaris came back home it had sunk to a little more than 170 thousand.(22) And the social, intellectual and religious condition of the people was not very bright either. The priests and monks were very numerous, and the majority of them were illiterate, or very nearly so, and in <sup>the case of</sup> most of them the place of spiritual religion was taken by superstition and ignorance.(23) The few schools that were to be found in the Island could hardly afford a higher education than the bare reading of the ecclesiastical books. There was, however, one bright exception. And that was the Monastery of St. Catherine in the town of Candia. Within the walls of that monastery there was operating a school, which gave to its pupils an education of a much higher standard. Out of the hands of the good monk Meletios Blastos many a young Cretan had gone out into the world with the thirst for something higher.(24) And one of them was young Constantine.

Blastos was quite famous in his time. He had made a name for himself. Nearly a century after his death, when Crete was captured by the Turks, a poem was printed in Venice by a certain Marinos Tzanes, in which he is lamenting the loss of his native island.(25) It is a rather queer poem, and the poet makes the two chief towns of the island, Candia and Rethimno, to quarrel with each

other over their respective good points. At last Rethimno deals a deadly blow on her adversary, by pointing out that if Candia shone at all it was in <sup>the</sup>light which she borrowed from her, and of course one of the luminaries which Candia had borrowed from Rethimno was "the good Meletios Blastos, the great teacher." It was at the feet of that monk that Constantine had sat to take his first lessons. And he never forgot his good, old teacher. Even when the Church had called him to its highest offices, he always found the time to send a brief note to the old monk in Crete. "How you gladdened my heart with your letter", he writes to him on one occasion.(26) And another time, "I was facing a great storm" (in some affair or other of the Church of Alexandria, of which he was now the Patriarch) "when your letter came, and what a comfort it gave me."(27) "Let others lisp childish talk", writes the celebrated pupil to his teacher, "let others play with childish toys; I know thee only as the well of Solomon's wisdom, which offers its waters in abundance to all who are thirsty."(28)

Apart from that first teacher of his, we know very little of Lucaris' earliest days in Crete. About his parents we know next to nothing. In later days, speaking of his parents, he says, "Not of a mixed stock, barbarians, hybrid, slaves, unknown people were my parents, but they were Greeks, decent, free people, prominent both in the State and in the Church."(29) And his good friend Meletios Pegas, the Patriarch of Alexandria, when he wanted to instil in the heart of the young boy the desire for great things, wrote to him, "To belong to great parents, is not the work of chance - it is God's gift."(30) Beyond this, however, and the fact that his father's name was Stephanos, we know very little about the old Lucaris couple. If any faith is to be given at all to Nicolaos Comnenos Papadopolus,(31) Stephanos Lucaris' family, which hailed from the Dalmatian coast, was a noble one, being related even with the Imperial house of the Palaeologi. However, Stephanos and his family passed through hard times, and at last they

were reduced to extreme poverty. They had to leave their country residence and come and settle in Candia, where old Lucaris took up the job of a butcher, his wife worked occasionally as a washerwoman, and little Constantine was apprenticed to a fisherman. It was on a journey to Alexandria, on that fisherman's boat, that he came under the notice of his distant relative Meletios Pegas, who thereafter took him under his protection, and was largely responsible for his being sent to the West for higher studies. This sounds quite a romantic story; whether it is true, it is difficult to say, as our only authority for it, Papadopolus, is not always trustworthy in his stories.

However, young Constantine, now in his sixteenth year, having found his dream of learning so suddenly interrupted, did not resign himself to his fate. If Venice is for the time being beyond his grasp, he can still do something in *his* present environment. So he unearthed some books which his old teacher Margunios had left somewhere in Candia, and in the company of those books, the Opuscles of Plutarch, a book or two of Cicero, the orations of Demosthenes, the Logic of Flaminus, a book of Aristoteles, one or two volumes of Eusebius, and a Latin Dictionary he had anything but a lazy time in his father's home.(32) His heart, however, is still in Venice. His one desire is to go back and resume his studies. And every courier leaving Crete for Venice is sure to take a letter from Constantine to his old friend Margunios, imploring him in pathetic terms to take him back to Venice and give him a second chance of having his studies finished.(33)

-o-      -o-      -o-

How did it happen? Did old Stephanos come to some unexpected money, which enabled him to send his son back to Italy? Or was it Margunios who made his promise good to his young friend that he would help him with all his means to prosecute his studies, even if that meant that he would share with him his



meagre food?(34) Or was it the newly discovered relative, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who stood his young protégé the expenses of a University course? We cannot say, but what matters is that in a few months time, a year at the most, the Cretan parenthesis came to an end, and in the year 1589 we find Constantine back in Italy. Not in Venice, however, this time, but in Padua. Which means that the period of his private education under Margunios was over, and he was now considered sufficiently prepared to be launched into a real University course. It was not before another six years, after he had graduated at Padua, that he left Italy for good.

Padua was one of the oldest Universities in Europe, and one of the two or three most important. When Lucaris matriculated it was at the height of its glory. It was about that time that Galileo was appointed to the Chair of Mathematics. The students were enrolled according to their nationality, and they thus formed the various "nations" of the University. Each nation chose one or two representatives - "conciliarii" - and these, together with the Rectors composed the governing body of the University. At the time of Lucaris' arrival the "nations" in Padua were very numerous, for students from all parts of Europe, who wanted to add some special distinction to their academical career, especially if they were studying medicine or law, were sure to put in some time of study in Padua. Lucaris just missed by one or two years the Englishman William Harvey, the renowned discoverer of the circulation of the blood, who was attracted to Padua by the fame of Fabricius, the great anatomist.

It is a pity that we cannot get much information about the members of the Greek "nation" at the time when Lucaris went there. There was an endowment for Cypriot students, and accordingly we find the names of many young men from Cyprus on the lists of the Paduan "alumni".(35) There was also a good number from Crete, as well as from other islands and the mainland of Greece. There is at least one distinguished name among the Greek fellow-students

of Lucaris, Ioannes Sozomenos, who later became the Librarian of St. Mark's Library in Venice.(36) Curiously enough, this man is also connected with the Scotch "nation", because at the year 1589-1590, for some reason he was elected a "conciliarius" for that "nation". That was, however, by no means a unique case, for in the forty or so years that preceded Lucaris' arrival we find at least two other Greeks, who were called to <sup>the</sup> honour of being "conciliarii" of the Scotch "nation", and three more who acted in that capacity for the English one.(37)

Of the several Greeks who occupied chairs in Padua, probably no one was more famous than our old friend Mark Mussuros. Erasmus, who was among his students, speaks of the great numbers who were drawn to his lectures, and he mentions the case of Raphael Regio, the 70 year old professor at that University, who at seven in the morning braved the bitter winter cold to attend the classes of Mussuros.(38)

Two of the professors, whose lectures Lucaris attended, are well known to us. Both are professors of Philosophy - Francis Piccolomini(39) and Caesar Cremonini, and both of them have left their mark in the history of the University. The first was already an elderly man and he was approaching the close of his remarkable career, when young Constantine joined his classes. He was a man of vast learning, and he held many responsible offices, besides his professorial chair. The younger man, Cremonini, was called to the second chair of Philosophy when Lucaris was in his second year. A contemporary of Cremonini has left us a sketch of his, and it is of a big, tall man, with a high forehead and searching eyes. He soon became very popular among the students at Padua, not only because of his fluent and well-prepared lectures, but also because of his custom to gather his students around him and discuss with them the subject on which he happened to be lecturing in the class-room. It was when Lucaris was in his third year that something happened which helps us realize the spirit which prevailed in the University of Padua. A deputation from the University, of which

Cremonini and Piccolomini were the leading members, presented itself before the Senate of Venice, and secured a decree by which a ban was imposed on the Jesuit Fathers as teachers in the University. With the sole exception of the "literae humaniores", the Jesuits were forbidden to lecture on any other subject within the University grounds.(40) That such a measure should be sought after, and secured against the Church's favourite and most powerful Order by men who were otherwise considered to be that Church's faithful sons, is a sufficient indication of the liberal spirit which prevailed in the University. And it has to be remembered that such a measure could not be taken in any other University in Italy. Padua was, in fact, the University of Venice, which had no University of its own; to use Renan's phrase, Padua was the "Quartier Latin" of Venice.(41) And it is not to be wondered at that much of its teaching was characterized by a distinct divergence from the doctrines of Rome. Indeed the Holy See did not pretend to conceal its great displeasure ~~at~~ the freedom of thought in which the students were permitted to indulge, or for the all-too-little measure of interference in the University affairs, which the Bishop of Padua was allowed. This displeasure, however, hardly made any impression on the Venetian authorities, and the University of Padua continued for a long time to be the most important centre of liberal thought in Southern Europe, and to attract an increasing number of students from Britain, Germany and other Protestant countries, who would not feel themselves safe to attend the other Italian Universities.

It was in that cosmopolitan and congenial environment that young Lucaris spent six whole years studying for his degree. Not that the smoothness of his studies was undisturbed. At any rate it is certain that the warm-hearted Cretan youth gave some uncomfortable moments to his old friend Margunios in Venice. At one time the rumour came to Margunios that for some reason his young protégé had stopped attending the public instruction at the University, and desired to have private tutors. So Margunios had to write to the young man a



stern letter, which seems to have been sufficient to drive that wild idea from his head.(42) But an even more serious trouble now arose. There has been found in the Venetian Archives a petition in which a number of foreign students were asking to be allowed to wear arms, and it appears that the necessary permits were granted to a number of English and other students.(43) This was some fifty years before Lucaris' time. But it seems that the craze was revived, and we can imagine the astonishment of old Margunios when the news came to him that his young protégé was seen strolling in the streets of Padua with a beautiful, gilt sword hanging gracefully from his waist, instead of being shut up in his room and making use of the last minute of daylight for his studies, seeing that, like most other students in Padua, he could hardly afford the luxury of a small lamp of oil. No wonder that very soon Lucaris received a letter in the well-known rigid classical style, in which his old teacher was telling him in very plain terms what he thought of his foolish behaviour.(44)

Apart, however, from these two incidents, it does not seem that Margunios ever had the occasion of feeling the least anxiety about the progress of his protégé in his University course. And it is delightful to see how the old man was himself enjoying that course through his correspondence with his young friend. For, with the exception of a letter in which he informed Lucaris that he was suffering from an attack of erysipelas, and implored him to enquire at the "doctors" at Padua and send him a bottle of medicine,(45) most of their correspondence was taken up either by exercises which the older man set to the younger, on, say, the difference between the philosophy of Plato and that of Aristoteles, or by other similar matters.(46)

But even though Lucaris had, in deference to his old teacher, very reluctantly to set aside his beautiful sword, he could not have lacked the opportunities of giving an outlet to the surplus of energy and mirth which was bubbling up in his youthful Cretan heart. During his course at least three times he must

have taken part in that tumultuous ceremony of the installation of the new Rector of the University, and together with the other students he would have been entertained by that dignitary at a banquet, or, in the case of a particularly stingy Rector, he would at least be given wine and spices. And afterwards he would go along with the others, to tear the clothes of the new Rector, and ask him to redeem whatever pieces he managed to pluck at a price which would keep him in handsome pocket money for a few days. And he would certainly not be missing at the other festivities with which the Paduan students tried to enliven their otherwise hard and extremely frugal life.(47)

And at last the long course came to its end. The terror-inspiring private examination was over, after which the more pleasant public test followed, and then the great day arrived, and in the presence of professors, fellow-students, and friends Lucaris was acclaimed in the Cathedral a "laureatus" of the University of Padua. Thus the long-drawn dream came to a beautiful end, and suddenly Lucaris felt himself "grown-up". Gone are now the days of care-free youth. Now he is a man - twenty three already; and he feels the need for action. The students' days were good, while they lasted, but now something bigger is stirring in his heart. The call of his enslaved people has been coming to him. And if he needed to be reminded of his duty to his suffering Motherland, a letter from his great protector, good old Meletios Pegas, the Patriarch of Alexandria, was sufficient to set his mind in the right frame - "...Labours and hardships are in store for thee, but the crown will certainly follow.... Do not get weary in the good fight. Show thyself worthy of God who hath enlisted thee in His army. Refresh my bowels in the Lord. Let me not be disappointed in the great hopes I have for thee."(48)

It was thus in a sober and thoughtful frame of mind that Constantine bade "farewell" to Italy and all the good things life had given him there, and he turned his face to the East and the work which now was calling him.

Footnotes to Chapter 1.

.....

- (1) Lucaris, according to a note by Archbishop Laud, mentioned, in Smith's "Collectanea", 65, was born c. 1558. But the most probable date of his birth, generally accepted, is 13 November 1572. (A. Leger, "Fragmentum Vitae" in Smith's "Collectanea" 77).
- (2) For details about his life see Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, "Historia Gymnasii Patavini", Vol. II, 264-265.
- (3) "Ὕμνοι Ἀνακρεόντειοι",  
Cum interpretatione Latina Conradi Rittershusii. Augustae. Ex officina typographica Joan. Praetorii. Anno S.U. MDCI.
- (4) His letter to Lucaris, Venice, 9 June 1589, in A. Legrand "Bibliographie Hellenique du XVII Siecle, IV, 177-178.
- (5) Letter 22 July 1589 in Legrand IV, 188-190.
- (6) Letter 19 June 1589, in Legrand IV, 180-181 and letter 8 July 1589, in Legrand IV, 181-183.
- (7) Letter of Nicolaos Rhodios to C.L., 27 October 1590, in Legrand IV, 202, 203.
- (8) As quoted by Alethea Wiel, "Venice", 311-312.
- (9) George Sandys, "A Relation of a Journey begun An.Dom. 1610;" London 1627, 2.
- (10) J.A. Crowder and G.B. Calvacaselle, "Titian: his life and times", Vol. I 1-24 passim, 51; Lacy Collison - Morley, "Italy after the Renaissance", 222; A.J. Grant, "A History of Europe from 1494 to 1610", 67-68; A.H. Johnson, "Europe in the 16th Century", 88.
- (11) J.E. Sandys, "History of Classical Scholarship", Vol. II, 79.
- (12) "Ετυμολογικὸν Μίγμα", Venetiis 1499.
- (13) See it in Ambroise Firmin-Didot, "Alde et l'hellenisme a Venise", 435-7.
- (14) Leopold Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries",

Vol. II, 114-115.

- (15) Alethea Wiel, "Venice", 375.
- (16) See Arnold Junn, "Venice", 35-39; Alethea Wiel, "Venice", 160.
- (17) Philarete Chasles, "Galileo Galilei", 28.
- (18) George Sandys, "Relation of a Journey begun An.Dom. 1610", 222.
- (19) "The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam, 1599-1600" published in the Volume of the Hakluyt Society, London, for the year 1893.
- (20) William Miller: "Essays on the Latin Orient" 177-8.
- (21) S. Xanthudides, "The Venetians in Crete and the Struggles of the Cretans", Athens 1939, (in Greek) 126-127, 159-160; W. Miller, op.cit. 179-180.
- (22) W. Miller, op. Cit. 177.
- (23) S. Xanthudides, op.cit. 161-3.
- (24) S. Xanthudides, op.cit. 162.
- (25) Legrand, II, 395.
- (26) Legrand, IV, 268.
- (27) Legrand, IV, 266-8.
- (28) Legrand, IV, 266-8.
- (29) Legrand, IV, 279.
- (30) Legrand, IV, 215.
- (31) "Historia Gymnasii Patavini", Vol. II, 292,3.
- (32) Legrand, IV, 177-178.
- (33) Legrand, IV, 175-7, 177-8, 178-9, 180-1.
- (34) Legrand, IV, 177-178.
- (35) Rashdall, "Medieval Universities", vol. II, 9-21.
- (36) Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, op.Cit., II 121-2.
- (37) I. A. Andrich: "De Natione Anglica et Scota Juristarum Universitatis Patavinae", Patavii, MDCCCXCII, 17, 35, 38, 50, 81, 83, 92.



- (38) Quoted by Ambroise Firmin-Didot, op.cit. 461.
- (39) Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, op.cit. Vol I, 339-340.
- (40) Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, op.cit. Vol I, 359-361.
- (41) Rashdall, op.cit. II, 21.
- (42) Legrand, IV, 193-4.
- (43) Francis Marion Crawford, "Gleanings from Venetian History", 574-9.
- (44) Legrand, IV, 193-4.
- (45) Legrand, IV, 195.
- (46) Legrand, IV, 190-92, 192-193.
- (47 ) D'Arcy Power, op.cit. 14-26.
- (48) Legrand, IV, 214-215.

.....

## CHAPTER 2

### Mission to Poland

In October 1596 two Greek clergymen, the Rev. Nicephorus Cantacuzinos and the Rev. Cyril Lucaris, entered the little town of Brest in Poland, the Brest-Litowsk of more recent times. The second named of the above was of course none other than the graduate of the University of Padua, who having been ordained to the priesthood ~~two~~ <sup>had</sup> years ago, dropped, as the custom was, his mundane name Constantine and adopted as his ecclesiastical name the one which had been rendered illustrious by a great predecessor of his in the See of Alexandria. From now on he will be known to us as Cyril Lucaris.

Of his ordination we know very little; not even the exact year in which that event took place is known to us with certainty.(1) Of one thing we are fairly sure, and that is that Cyril was ordained in Constantinople. Whether he went from Padua straight to Crete we do not know. Some writers think that before he returned to his homeland he visited some other countries of Europe(2), but this seems rather doubtful. Some of these writers seem to have confused the Latin name of Padua, 'Patavium', with that of Holland, 'Batavia', and have sent Cyril on a most doubtful journey to that distant land. However this may be, eventually Cyril found himself in Constantinople, where his uncle Meletios Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria, was then filling as a locum-tenens the vacant Ecumenical Throne(3), and it was at the hands of his old uncle and benefactor that he received the priesthood(4) - the uncle who had cherished so many hopes of him in his student days in Padua. That we find him now in this little Polish town, entrusted at this early stage of his career with a delicate and difficult task, is evidence that old Meletios

still had great hopes of his nephew and thought highly of his ability.

In order to understand, however, the character of this mission we have first to have a glance at the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the land of Poland at that time.

We are now, in the year 1596, in the reign of Sigismund III, the son of John III of Sweden, whom Catherine Jagello bore for him while he was kept in prison by his brother Eric. Sigismund had now been nine years on the throne and had ample time to show his great dislike for any other form of the christian faith than the one taught him by his Catholic mother, and the royal dislike was not slow in making itself felt in the public life of the country. Not that Sigismund was the first to lend the royal authority to the spread of the movement of the Counter-Reformation in Poland. It was his predecessor, Stephen Bathory, who <sup>had</sup> dealt the first big blows against Protestantism in Poland and prepared the way for the Roman Church to assume once again supremacy in that country. Like Henry of Navarre, Stephen had given up his Protestant faith in order to become a king, and although opinion about him is divided(5), it seems that he was inclined by temperament towards a policy of moderation in church affairs. If that was his intention, however, the queen, the bishops and the special envoy of the Holy See saw to it that he did not put it in practice, and, probably against his better judgment, he was gradually driven to a policy of a more open protection of the Roman faith at the expense of the Protestant and the Greek Orthodox churches(6). It was before his accession to the throne that the Jesuits entered Poland, through the aid of Cardinal Hosius, the bishop of Ermeland, who founded a College for them in Brannenberg in the year 1569(7). But it was chiefly under Stephen Bathory that that Society marked its first big successes in Poland. It was due to the liberality of the royal treasury that the Jesuits were able to cover the land with their colleges - at Riga and Dorpat, at Wilna and Polock, at Pultusk and Lublin,

and in a very short time the Society of Jesus numbered as many as three hundred and sixty members in the country. Not without reason did the Jesuits call the ex-Protestant king "Pater et patronus noster".(8)

Things were brought to a climax, however, under his successor Sigismund III. What Stephen started as a matter of policy, Sigismund continued out of deep personal conviction, and under him new measures were taken to promote the Roman conquest of the country. When Clement VIII was still a cardinal and a legate in Poland, he had given to Sigismund, then a prince, the advice ~~not~~ to bestow public offices ~~only~~ on Roman Catholics only. This advice was not forgotten when Sigismund came to the throne, and to measure the efficacy of the weapon now in the hands of the reactionary forces in the country one has to remember that not less than twenty thousand offices, spiritual and temporal, were "in the gift of the king". This new measure was not slow in bringing about the desired results, and men, especially of the upper classes, Protestant and Greek Orthodox, began now, driven by the force of things, to find their way into the Roman fold. Clement VIII was right when he ascribed the progress of Catholicism in Poland chiefly to the measure which he himself had advocated.(9)

While this measure was bearing its fruit, another measure seems to have fallen with a special force on the Greek Orthodox element. This was the decision to exclude all non-Catholic bishops from a seat in the senate. The situation thus created was felt with a particular bitterness by the Greek Orthodox clergy and was soon followed by a good measure of success within that church(10). Things were thus being made more and more difficult for the Greek Orthodox Church, and, strange to say, they were made even more difficult as a result of a visit paid to Poland by the highest authority of that Church itself. It would take us too far afield to enter into the details of that visit. Suffice it to say that there was in Poland a rivalry between the Greek Orthodox clergy and the "Confraternities", at a time when the danger of a Roman invasion made it imperative



that all elements within that Church should unite in a common effort. To make things worse, there broke out suddenly an ugly scandal of immorality in connection with the bishop of Loutsk. And, above all, there was the permanent vice of the very low educational standard, in many cases illiteracy, of the Greek Orthodox clergy, who thus stood no chances against the vastly superior clergy of the Roman church. It was in order to tackle the situation that arose out of the combination of these evil factors that Jeremiah, the Patriarch of Constantinople, paid a visit to Poland and Russia. Jeremiah was a good man, one of the few bright exceptions in the long list of unworthy men who at that time occupied the Ecumenical Throne. In his visit to Poland, however, he did not exhibit much ability of administration - but then the Greek Orthodox clergy were never very good statesmen, in sharp contrast to their brethren within the Roman church. And when the visit came to an end, Jeremiah left things behind him worse, if anything. Shortly afterwards he died, and his successors could do very little to give any practical help. Thus when the Roman danger was imminent, the Greek Orthodox Church in Poland was left practically alone to face the situation.

Practically, but not quite, as the presence of Cyril Lucaris and Nicephorus Cantacuzinos in Poland at that time witnesses. And this brings us back to our story. Of Cyril's movements in Poland we cannot speak with certainty, as our authorities do not agree between themselves. (11) Certain it is, however, that in the execution of this difficult mission he undertook repeated journeys to Poland, that he spent nearly five years there, and that it was there he had the first of his encounters with the Roman church, which were to fill the whole of his adventurous career. To Poland he came as an "Exarch", a special envoy, of the Patriarch of Alexandria, while Cantacuzinos acted as an Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Meletios Pegas would have come himself, such was the importance he attached to that mission, but urgent business <sup>had</sup> kept him in Constantinople and Lucaris was despatched in his stead. Cyril arrived in Poland when the situation

had reached its sinister climax, just after the Roman bomb had burst in Brest - too late to avert it, not late enough to be safe from the explosion. He came too late to take part in the first Council of Brest which took place in 1595, and just in time to take part in the second which took place the following year. But the fate of the church had already been sealed.

We already saw how bitterly the higher Greek Orthodox clergy felt their exclusion from the Senate because of their religious convictions. As things grew worse, with the passing of time, there arose within the church an influential party, under the leadership of no other than Michael the Metropolitan of the Greek Orthodox Church in Poland and Ignatius Potoski, the bishop of Vladimir, which advocated union with Rome according to the rules of Florence. Secret negotiations were held which lasted five years, the result of which was the first Council of Brest which was held in June 1595, and at which it was agreed that the Polish church should submit to the authority of the Pope and accept the doctrine of the Roman church, retaining, however, the Eastern form of liturgy, communion in both kinds, the Julian calendar, and the marriage of the priesthood. Two bishops were commissioned by the Council to proceed to Rome and offer to the Pope the submission of the Polish Church. Clement VIII, who was already looking at this Polish affair as a step-stone in an Eastward drive as far as China and India, was not too hard in getting persuaded to extend the Apostolic pardon to these erring children and thus it was that two days before Christmas 1595 and in the midst of great jubilation the Uniate was born in Rome. (12)

As soon as the news spread in Poland, horror struck in the hearts of the masses who had remained faithful to the Greek Orthodox tradition. A wave of anger swept the country against those spiritual leaders who had betrayed their trust. And when a second Council was convened at Brest to ratify the agreement of Rome, there flocked to it in great numbers those who had remained loyal to the Greek Orthodox church. It was at this council that the Exarchs of the

Eastern Patriarchates presented themselves, the Greek Orthodox party in it being headed by the famous Voivada of Kieff, the now one hundred-year old Prince Constantine of Ostrogg, the man to whom the Greek Orthodox Church in Russia, in the days of Ivan the Terrible, owed the first printed edition of the Bible and the other sacred books in the Slavonic language. The fate of the Council was, however, settled beforehand. The Romanist party, though hardly as numerous as their opponents, had the protection of the king and this gave them the upper hand. It was not therefore long before the Council split into two smaller assemblies, the one attended by the Unionists meeting in the church of the Virgin, where Te Deums were sung for the happy conclusion of this matter, the anti-Unionist Council holding its meetings in a private house, where a solemn protest was passed against the treachery of the Unionist bishops, and then the two rival assemblies promptly proceeded to anathematize each other.(13)

-o-    -o-    -o-    -o-

As one can see from the above, Cyril's share in facing the issues with which the Church in Poland was suddenly confronted was small enough. Apart from the encouragement which the presence of the special envoy of the See of Alexandria must have given to those who had remained loyal to the Greek Orthodox Church, he had little more to offer at that late hour of the day in which he arrived. But then those who had sent the two Exarchs could have had little hope that they could be of any real help to the Church in facing its immediate difficulties, late as they appeared on the scene. The best they could hope for their delegates was that they might help save some wrecks out of that great storm which <sup>had</sup> broken out against the Church. This Cyril endeavoured to do, and in handling the situation with which he was confronted he gives us the first signs that he is a man of the long view and he prefers methods, which will only yield fruit after a long time, to methods which promise spectacular but short-lived success.

It couldn't have taken Cyril a very long time to realize that the one



great defect of the Greek Orthodox Church, which placed it in a position of disadvantage as against the Roman, was the very low educational standard both of its laymen and the majority of its clergy. As a letter from a fellow-worker of his, Gabriel Dorotheides, received about that time, informed him, "the Greek Orthodox population of Poland is scoffed<sup>at</sup> by the outsiders for their ignorance" and "many there are who on account of this ignorance are driven to other forms of faith." (14) In the case of many priests ignorance was accompanied by poverty which again placed the Greek Orthodox clergy at a disadvantage as against the well-provided-for clergy of the Roman church. In another letter the same priest Dorotheides complains that he couldn't come to visit Cyril, as it was raining very hard and he could not wade the mud, having no shoes to put on. (15)

Cyril therefore saw that if something of lasting value was to be done for the Church in Poland, he had to start at the beginning, and this he did. The five years which he spent in Poland he devoted to developing the schools of the Greek Orthodox community in that country and to setting up a printing house in order to produce the books which its people so urgently needed.

He started work at Wilna, much to the regret of Dorotheides, who was living at Lwow and strongly urged Cyril to come and work there, presenting to him in as bright colours as he could the much better opportunities which Lwow offered for such a work as against Wilna. (16) In Wilna he laboured for twenty months as the Rector of the Greek Orthodox School, (17) and it was there that he also set up his printing house, and we are not surprised to find that among the first books he saw through the press was one by his own uncle Meletios Pegas, "whose authority, as he wrote himself in the preface, not Egypt alone, but the whole of Greece is ready to obey." (18)

While in Wilna, he did not forget the needs of the faithful in other parts of the country, especially those of his friend Dorotheides, and by frequent

letters he set for him a course of studies including readings from Aristotle.(19) One can therefore imagine the joy of the latter, when at the end of twenty months Cyril left Wilna and came to work in Lwow. But whereas in Wilna he served as the Rector of the already existing school, in Lwow he was the instrument of founding one, as we can gather from a letter of Pegas to the Bishop of Lwow.(20) Thus was Cyril helping to spread knowledge among the Greek Orthodox people in Poland.

This work was carried on under circumstances of great hardship and in an environment of unconcealed hostility. At one time a letter from a friend warns him not to come to Lwow at that particular time for reasons which the writer said he did not care to specify.(21) On another occasion his mail from Egypt is withheld by friends lest it should fall into the hands of enemies.(22) On still another occasion he complains he cannot proceed to Ostrow.(23) At one time the rumour was spread in Lwow by the Romanist party that Meletios Pegas himself had submitted to Rome, and as it was to be expected, this created much confusion among the Greek Orthodox flock in that city.(24) And the terror and confusion was intensified when the news came that Nicephorus, the Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople, was arrested by order of Sigismund and was put to death.(25) At this time Cyril himself ran the risk of being arrested and he had to flee for his life and seek the protection of Prince Constantine Basil, in whose castle he spent some time.(26) In the midst of so much work and so many dangers he did not neglect his own reading, and among the authors he read at that time was Thomas Aquinas and the historian Cedrinus.(27)

Cyril's stay in Poland was not uninterrupted. At those unsettled times the need must have arisen for consultations with his superiors, and thus it is that we find him on August 6, 1598 preaching at Callipolis of Thrace and on Christmas eve of the same year at Crete.(28) He went back to Poland in 1599 and this time he was the bearer of a letter to King Sigismund himself. Sigismund had written to Pegas asking him that, for the sake of peace within the Church of Christ, he

should submit to the authority of the Pope and accept the doctrine of the Roman Church. It was the answer of the Patriarch to that request that Cyril brought to the king - a mission not free of dangers, considering the contents of the letter and the temperament of its recipient. The Patriarch, however, committed the safety of "the Reverend Father Cyril, Exarch of this Apostolic See and a son of ours" to the clemency of the king.(29)

Cyril did not prolong much more his stay in Poland. On the one hand, he realized that under the existing conditions he could not offer much more to the cause of his church in that country. On the other hand, the call of his homeland came again to him, once more through his uncle Meletios. An earlier letter of the uncle had given to the nephew a prophetic hint about the future: "The Throne (of Alexandria) does not ask anything of thine own, but thyself."(30) And now that he feels the end approaching, Meletios gives his nephew his last injunctions. "My son Cyril, he writes, I have come to the end of my life. I have tasted pains and dangers and worries and I am dying a happy man..... One counsel I have to give thee: Fight to preserve the faith..... I have known thee to be faithful, but, loving thee as I do, I could not restrain myself from giving a superfluous counsel."(31) That was enough for Cyril; as soon as it was possible he started on his journey to Egypt.

His enemies in Poland, however, did not let him go without giving him a last hit. A letter was forged by the leader of the Jesuits in that country, Peter Scarga, written apparently by Cyril and addressed to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Lwow Demetrius Solicowski, in which Cyril after speaking of "the See of St. Peter" with much reverence, expresses the hope that the union of the Eastern with the Western Church would some time be effected.(32) That this letter was a forgery is evident. Lucaris himself vehemently protested that he never wrote it.(33) Then, the contents of the letter are in sharp contrast both to the struggles of Cyril for five whole years in Poland and to his character, as it is known to us. And even were one to accept that Cyril was

obliged to write such a letter in order to purchase security for himself, one would expect to see the letter making its appearance at the time when Cyril was moving up and down Poland in the midst of great dangers and when his fellow-worker Nicephorus was put to death, rather than at the time of his departure for the safety of Egypt. And, finally, if the letter were genuine, why, one should ask, did not Scarga or Solicowski bring it to the light immediately, and thus deal against the Greek Orthodox Church in Poland a big blow, instead of waiting, as they did, seventeen whole years before they published it.(34)

So Cyril left the land of his first labours. On his way he passed through the Greek Orthodox Communities of Rumania, where he preached the Word,(35) and on the 11th September 1601 he was in Egypt. Two days later Meletios Pegas died.(36)

. . . . .



Footnotes to Chapter 2.

- .....
- (1) T. Smith, "Collectanea", 7; A. Leger, "Fragmentum Vitae", in T. Smith's Collectanea, 77; Father Simon, "The Critical History of the Religions and Customs of the Eastern Nations", Engl. Transl. By A. Lovell, 1685, 46-47 places the ordination before the studies in Padua. He gives no authority. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, "Cyril Lucaris", Athens, 1939, 15 states that Cyril was ordained in Crete a deacon in 1592 and the following year a priest. He gives no authorities.
- (2) A. Pichler, "Geschichte des Protestantismus in der Orientalischen Kirche in 17 Jahrhundert", 1862, 61-66; Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus", II, 265; Kimmel "Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis", 1750, p. XXIV.
- (3) Smith, op.cit. 7.
- (4) All the above authorities.
- (5) Cf. B. J. Kidd, "The Counter-Reformation", 221-223, and Leopold Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries", Engl. transl. II, 137-139.
- (6) B.J. Kidd, 221-223.
- (7) Ranke, op.cit. I, 451.
- (8) Th. Griesinger, "The Jesuits", 275,277; B.J. Kidd, 221-223.
- (9) Ranke, op.cit. II, 137-142.
- (10) Th. Smith, 9; Ranke, op.cit. II, 142.
- (11) Th. Smith, op.cit. 10-13; Leger, op.cit. 78; G. Hoffmann, S.I. "Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris und die Romische Kirche" in Orientalia Christiana, May 1928, 9.
- (12) Smith, op.cit. 9; Ranke, op.cit. II, 142.
- (13) Smith, 10.
- (14) E. Legrand, "Bibliographie Hellenique", XVII siecle, Vol IV, 225-227.
- (15) Legrand, IV, 221.
- (16) Legrand, IV, 225-227; 228-229.
- (17) Leger, op.cit. 78.
- (18) Chr. Papadopoulos, op.cit. 21.
- (19) Legrand, IV, 221.
- (20) A.P. Kerameus, "Greek Texts Useful for the Study of the History of

Rumania", 416.

(21) Legrand, IV, 217.

(22) Legrand, IV, 229-230.

(23) Legrand, IV, 220.

(24) Legrand, IV, 228-229.

(25) Leger, op. cit. 78, 79.

(26) Leger, op.cit. 79. About the duration of Cyril's stay with Constantine Basil. there seems to be some confusion.

(27) Legrand, IV, 220.

(28) Codex of Metochium of Holy Sepulchre in Constantinople 408, pp. 44,49.

(29) Smith, op.cit. 11.

(30) Legrand, IV, 215.

(31) A. Ninolaki, "Meletios Pegas" 165; Sathas, "Modern Greek Literature" 209.

(32) Leger, op. cit. 79,80; Smith, op.cit. 12.

(33) Smith, op.cit. 13.

(34) Chr. Papadopoulos, op.cit. 27.

(35) Codex of Metochium 408, pp. 58,73,81,84.

(36) Chr. Papadopoulos, *op.cit* 28.

.....

### CHAPTER 3

#### Patriarch of Alexandria

No sooner did Cyril set foot on Egyptian soil, than he was confronted with one of the great crises of his life. The orphaned church immediately elected him to be the successor of Meletios Pegas, and thus was Cyril raised in 1601 to the See of Alexandria at the young age of twenty-nine.(1) This was a wise election and Cyril held this responsible office for twenty years, until he was called to the even more responsible office of the See of Constantinople.

Cyril's elevation to the Throne of Alexandria is a convenient point to introduce into our narrative one who spared no pains in maligning his memory. Leo Allatius, a Greek Roman Catholic and contemporary of Lucaris, born in the island of Chios, was brought to Rome while he was still a child and became one of the most distinguished pupils of the Greek College of St. Athanasius, of which we shall have occasion to speak in greater detail. Pope Alexander VII appointed him keeper of the Vatican Library, and here he spent the rest of his life writing books. He was a man of great learning. And it is a pity that on several occasions, in order to promote the cause that was nearest his heart, the submission of the Greek Church to the Pope, he deliberately introduced falsehoods in his writings. He has earned, not without justice, the title "Doctor Falsiloquus"(2) and John Covel(3) preserves a saying of Dositheus, according to which Allatius at his deathbed ate his own tongue, being in an agony for the many lies which that tongue had said. In connection with Cyril's election to the Throne of Alexandria, Allatius in his "De Ecclesiae Occidentalis et Orientalis Perpetua Consensione", Rome

1655, Liber III, 1073-1074, accuses Cyril of having bought the throne with money which he had collected for the needs of the Church of Alexandria, ~~which~~ while the majority of the bishops were favouring the election of Gerasimos Spartaliotes. That this is a calumny with no historical foundation whatever is proved by the fact that ever since his election and all through his life Cyril enjoyed the friendship and the esteem of Spartaliotes, with whom, when he was elevated to the Throne of Constantinople and the latter occupied the Throne of Alexandria, he kept a friendly correspondence. This would never have happened, had Spartaliotes known that Cyril had deprived him of his election to the See of Alexandria by means such as those attributed to him by Allatius.

It was a difficult task that which Cyril was now facing. The Church in Egypt was anything but flourishing at the time of his elevation to the See. It is true that in his love for the Church of which he was the pastor, he speaks of it with great pride, and compares it with the Church of Constantinople, much to the disadvantage of the latter, priding himself on the fact that the Church of Alexandria had managed to preserve its independence from the Turks.(4) All these boasts, however, refer mostly to the past for at the time of Cyril's arrival the Church in Alexandria had for a long time been declining. The Greek Orthodox population of Egypt had been steadily diminishing, and their communities were small islands in a sea of Coptes, which was steadily increasing, and the three or four Metropolitans that surrounded the Patriarch had nominal rather than actual authority.(5) Cyril himself in his letter to Uytenbogaert of 10 Oct. 1613,(6) speaking of the Coptes in Egypt, says that one could say of them what Homer writes of the Greeks and Trojans: "καὶ πολλαῖν δέκαδες δαίαν δῖνονόιο", i.e. the number of the Coptes would be ten times as large than that of the Greek Orthodox. An amusing detail in this letter of Cyril's is an unexpected etymology which he attributes to the word "Copte". "They call them Coptes", he says, "because they circumcise themselves." One would



expect Cyril to be aware of the real derivation of the word from "Egypt".

And the Coptes were not the only headache of Cyril while in Alexandria. In his letter to David le-Léu de Wilhem, of March 20, 1618(7) he complains that the Nestorians, who fifty years ago were almost non-existent in the country, have now covered the whole of the land and they have close fellowship with the Coptes, "the blind with those who are equally blind." This sect, in his letter to Uyttenbogaert (see above), he finds the one most infected by heresy and he calls its followers the "pests of the Orient". This is a language rather too strong for the head of a church to use, and one can only explain it as an indication of Cyril's disappointment over the decline of the once flourishing Greek Orthodox Church in Egypt, as against the "heresies" whose followers were steadily increasing.

Soon after his arrival in Egypt, Cyril took up his official residence in Cairo. This must have been another sad reminder to him of the decline of the church of Alexandria. He himself in his letter to Uyttenbogaert attributes the change of residence to the better climat<sup>e</sup> of Cairo, but De la Croix(8), explains this by the larger degree of freedom which the Christians had in Cairo, and George Sandys(9) gives the real explanation when he says that the "Metropolis of Africa....now hath nothing left her but ruines..... the buildings now being, are meane and few, erected on the ruines of the former: that part that lyeth along the shore inhabited only, the rest desolate." That is how it happened that the once famous city of Alexandria could no longer serve as the official residence of the successors of the Great Athanasius and Cyril.

If, however, residence in Cairo lacked the historical atmosphere of Alexandria, it made up for it by the luxuries of one of the great, modern cities of that time. Sandys in his "Relation of a Journey"(10) shows how greatly impressed he was by the beauties of the city. "Than Cairo no City can be more populous, nor better served with all sorts of provision. Here hatche

they egges by artificial heate in infinite numbers" - and he goes on to give a minute description of this wonderful thing. The beautiful houses, the "magnificient Mosques", the "Santons", or lodgings for "fooles and mad men", of whom, it appears, Cairo had more than its fair share, the "Serraglios" of the important people, the women "too fine-fingered to meddle with housewifry, riding abroad upon pleasure on eassie-going Asses", the great variety of public amusements, such as "the Raven which spoke" and the goat that <sup>did</sup> made acrobatic feats, and the camel that danced, and the ass that did such tricks "as if possessed with reasons", made Cairo one of the great cities of the world.

We may doubt, however, whether Cyril while in that great city, had much time to spare for the raven that spoke or the ass that made tricks. He was much too busy for that. It is a pity that we do not have as much information about his life in Egypt, as we would have wished; such information, however, as we have, gives us a picture of an ever-growing and ever-expanding activity.

We are especially poor in information about his first years in Egypt. We know, however, that as soon as he was established in the See he started preaching. He realized that one of the greatest enemies which he had to fight was the ignorance of his own people. Therefore from the very beginning of his career to the end he was a preacher. Many of the sermons which he preached at that time have come down to us. We have for example fifty two of the sermons he preached in Cairo in the years 1609 and 1610. And we have others which he preached at other stages of that early period of his work<sup>(11)</sup> The years 1608 and 1609 were taken up by another kind of activity. When Cyril was elected Patriarch he found the See heavily burdened by debts. On the other hand, if the Church was to accomplish its work, some buildings were urgently needed. Cyril, therefore, sent the monk Maximus Peloponnesius on a tour to the Churches of *Greece and Russia to collect funds for the Church of* Alexandria. As soon as the first proceeds of Maximus' labours were received in Cairo, Cyril immediately started his building programme. This effort, however,

came to an abrupt end, as Maximus was seized by pirates, and his tour was cut short.(12)

A little earlier Cyril had an occasion of visiting the island of Cyprus. The Church in that island was passing at that time through some trouble. In 1600 the Archbishop of Cyprus, Athanasius, was deposed by the Ecumenical Patriarch, and in his place was elected Benjamin, a capable and good priest. The deposed Archbishop, however, and his party persecuted Benjamin and at last they succeeded in driving him out of the island. Thus the Church in Cyprus found itself without a Pastor, and the chief men of the island wrote and asked Cyril to come and help them. Cyril accordingly went to Cyprus, and we have a few sermons preached by him in the island during that troubled period.(13) After long deliberation, Cyril at last ordained Christodulus as the Archbishop of the island.(14) Christodulus held this office for thirty two years.

Shortly afterwards Cyril was called to Jerusalem to take part in the induction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Theophanes (1608-1644), with whom he was united by close friendship ever ~~after~~. While in Jerusalem, he had an opportunity of visiting the Holy Sepulchre, and he expressed himself quite strongly against the ornaments with which, with the passing of the years, the religious zeal of the people had deformed the cave in which the dead body of our Lord was lain.(15) Was this an indication that Cyril's thought <sup>had</sup> begun to move along paths of a more simple christian faith?

In 1602, one year after his elevation to the Throne of Alexandria, he renewed an earlier acquaintance which was going to prove of great importance in his life. While still a monk he had met a Dutchman, Cornelius Haga, who was then travelling in the Levant. Haga was now appointed Envoy of the States General to the Porte Sublime, and he came to Constantinople, where he met his old acquaintance, now Patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril beseeched him to furnish him with some books by Protestant divines, and Haga did not fail to pass on this



request to Holland, and shortly afterwards Cyril was receiving the first batch of books of Protestant Theology.(16)

What the immediate results of the reading of those books were one cannot say with certainty. A few years later, however, Cyril was put in touch (apparently once again through the intervention of Cornelius Haga) with J. Uytenbogaert, a famous Dutch theologian, who about that time had succeeded Jacob Arminius in the leadership of the famous Arminian School of theology. It is very interesting to note in the correspondence which Cyril exchanged with these people the progress which slowly and gradually but steadily he was making towards an Evangelical belief.

As early as in 10 October 1613, in his letter to J. Uytenbogaert(17), he speaks of the Sacraments as being two only in number. And he does not attribute to them, as such, any ~~magical~~ power, but he states that in order that they should confer grace, they must be united with faith. He hastens, however, to state that faith has no power to save without the aid of the sacraments. Speaking more especially of the sacrament of baptism, he says that baptism cannot save if it is not accompanied by repentance; it is not, however, clear what exactly he meant by this. A certain confusion exists also in his mind concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He says: "This Sacrament has been given us in order to celebrate the memory of the Lord's death and to receive His body and blood." That he still accepts the doctrine of Transubstantiation is made evident by the fact that further down in the same letter he quotes a prayer which is offered at the Lord's Supper and in which there is the petition that the bread and wine should be changed into the body and blood of Christ. Against the use of this prayer he does not put forward any criticism.

In the same letter, however, he makes a great concession to the Protestant faith, when he admits the existence within the Greek Church of certain



erroneous practices, "which, he says, <sup>we cannot remove</sup> on account of great difficulties". "But, he adds, in contrast to the Roman, the Greek Church does not hold those practices of hers, which have not expressly been ordained by God, to be necessary unto salvation, but on the contrary she holds that those practices are liable to error, because only that is infallible which God Himself has ordained, and therefore all such practices must be submitted to the scrutiny of the Scriptures and of the Holy Spirit."

Another famous Protestant divine, once more a Dutchman, with whom Cyril came in contact, was David le-Leu de Wilhem, who later became a member of the Council of the Princes of Orange and Brabant. During the years 1617, 1618 and 1619 he travelled in the Levant and he had the opportunity of visiting Lucaris in Cairo. With him Cyril exchanged many letters. In a letter to him, (18) Cyril stresses the unique position which he gives to the Scriptures as the Rule of the Christian Faith. And in this what he doesn't say is more eloquent than what he says, as one would expect a Greek Orthodox theologian to give alongside the Scriptures a place to Tradition as a factor in the Rule of Faith. It seems, however, that by this time, Cyril had begun occupying in his theological outlook a position distinctly different from that of a Greek Orthodox divine. In his next letter e.g. to De Wilhem, (19) he gives thanks to God for "he can state with confidence that in the fundamentals of the faith he is in agreement with him" ("Εἰς τὰ καίρια τῆς πίστεως συμφωνοῦμεν." ) - a remarkable statement, in view of the great divergencies existing between the Greek Orthodox position and that of the Protestant Church. In the same letter he enumerates the things which should take place, if the Greek Church is to be reformed, and among these he places "the Evangelical simplicity" which should take the place of "superstition", and he adds that nothing brings more disgrace on the Greek Church than its superstitions. The same subject of the reform of the Greek Church is touched in a later letter (20) and Cyril is making there use of very

strong words to express both his desire for such a reform and his pessimism about its feasibility.

Some obscurity once again prevails concerning Cyril's position in connection with the Lord's Supper. In another letter to De Wilhem, (21) he says that as regards this point he can distinguish three schools of doctrine: (a) the Papist, (b) the Lutheran, and (c) the Orthodox, and he states that, as for himself, he follows the Orthodox. One wonders whether he makes here any distinction between the Lutheran and the Calvinist School, <sup>and whether</sup> he identifies the Orthodox position with the Calvinist one. The text of his letter does not allow any definite conclusions to be drawn; the above assumption, however, is rendered more likely by the fact that at that time - and even to this present day, so far as terminology at least is concerned - the Greek Orthodox Church did not take the same rigid attitude as regards "transubstantiation" as the Roman Church has done. The above assumption is rendered even more likely in a subsequent letter to the same person, 13 March 1619, (22) in which Cyril expresses his joy for the fact that as regards the Lord's Supper he is of one mind with De Wilhem, although some element of ambiguity is introduced when he says that he who participates in the Lord's Supper, animated by faith, "partakes not only of the visible Sacrament of the Body and Blood, but also in a spiritual way, of the body and blood of Jesus Christ."

Where one can notice, however, most clearly the distance covered by Cyril's mind since his earlier days, is his letter to Mark Antonio de Dominis, who was formerly a Roman Catholic Archbishop and had embraced the Protestant faith. The letter bears date 6 September 1618. (23) "There was a time, when we were bewitched, before we understood what was the very pure Word of God; and although we did not communicate with the Roman Pontiff, .... we abominated the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, as opposed to the Faith, in good truth not knowing what we abominated. But when it pleased the merciful God to enlighten

us, and to give us understanding of our former error, we began to reflect what it was our duty to do; and as it is the part of a good citizen in any section to defend the juster cause, much more did I think it the duty of a good Christian not to dissimulate his sentiments in matters pertaining to salvation; but ingenuously to embrace that side which is most consentaneous to the Word of God. What then did I do? Having obtained, through the kindness of friends, some writings of Evangelical Doctors, which the East have not only never seen, but, through the influence of the censures of Rome, never even heard of, I invoked earnestly the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and for three years compared the doctrine of the Greek and Latin Church with that of the Reformed. ....I left the Fathers and took for my guide Scripture and the Analogy of Faith alone. At length, through the grace of God, because I discovered that the cause of the Reformers was the more just, and more in accordance with the doctrine of Christ, I embraced it. I can no longer endure to hear men say that the comments of human tradition are of equal weight with Holy Scripture..... In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we constantly believe that Christ is present, not feignedly and symbolically, but truly and properly, essentially and really, as the Word of our Lord prove<sup>d</sup>, "which is given for you." With respect to the manner of the Presence, our Greek Church is at variance both with those who adopt the chimera of transubstantiation, and with the erroneous opinion of the Ubiquitaries. ....As for Image Worship, it is impossible to say how pernicious under present circumstances it is..... not that I think that Images are absolutely speaking to be condemned, since when not adored they cannot occasion any mischief; but I abhor the idolatry which they cause to these blind worshippers. And although I in my private prayers I have sometimes observed that the Crucifix was an assistance to my mind, as bringing more readily before it the act itself of the Passion, yet because I see that the vulgar, not to say it of some who are wise enough in their own opinions, are carried away from the true and spiritual



worship and latria which is due to God alone, I had rather that all would entirely abstain from this so perilous handle of sin..... As for the invocation of Saints, time was, when I did not perceive how they eclipsed the glory of our Lord Christ...."

Speaking of Cyril's theological position, it is interesting to notice the various theological questions that were occupying his mind at that time. In his letter to Uyttenbogaert, 10th October 1613(24) he asks the latter to supply him with a list of authors on various books of the Bible, also with a Confession of his faith and an interpretation of the ceremonies that are celebrated in the Reformed Churches, as well as a statement of their discipline. At this time his mind seems to be mainly occupied with the big questions of "free will" and "predestination".(25) In his letter of 30 May 1619(26) to the same person he confesses that he finds this a most difficult question and he asks whether De Wilhem could send him a book on the subject. Later on(27) he returns to the subject and promises to write something on it himself.

Another question which occupied him in the correspondence which he exchanged with his friends at this time was the famous "Filioque", and in the handling of this subject(28) he showed himself a deep thinker and an able disputant. He repudiates of course the addition which the Churches in the West have made to the article of the Creed dealing with the Holy Spirit, and takes, in a very able way, the line that when one speaks of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father one means that the Father is the Source in which the third Person of the Godhead has its "hypostatic essence" and that if we were to accept that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as well, it would be the same as if we accepted that the Holy Spirit has His "source of essence" in two different principles. He is unwilling to accept this "absurdity", as he calls it; he accepts, however, that the Holy Spirit, who has His source of being in the Father, is being given to mankind through the Son.



To the second half of Cyril's term in Alexandria belong the journeys which brought him to Constantinople, Mount Athos and Moldavia<sup>Moldavia</sup>. Early in 1611 we find him in Constantinople, as we can gather from sermons which he preached in that city in January and February of that year.(29) Later in the year he is back in Cairo, where he stayed only a few months and early in 1612 he is once again in Constantinople. The Ecumenical Patriarch Neophytus II had been deposed because of the support which he gave to the activities of the Jesuits in Constantinople, and Cyril was called to fill the See as a Locum-Tenens as his uncle Meletios Pegas had done on a previous occasion.(30) In a short time the election took place, Cyril being one of the candidates, and he would have certainly been appointed Ecumenical Patriarch, had he consented to pay the large sum of money which the Turkish Government required in order to ratify his election.(31) As, however, Cyril did not consent to do this, his opponent Timothy II occupied the throne. The party spirit ran very high on that occasion in Constantinople and Cyril found that his life would be in danger at the hands of Timothy and his followers, were he to return to Egypt, so he betook himself to Mount Athos, where he spent some time with its monks.(32) And when he saw that even there he was not safe from the plots of Timothy II, he was obliged to depart to Tergoviste, of Vlachia<sup>Wallachia</sup>, the Prince of which Voivoda<sup>e</sup> Radu Michnea, a former fellow-student of his in Venice, received him cordially and gave him hospitality. The real cause of Timothy's enmity was his jealousy against an opponent far more able than himself; he disguised this, however, under the excuse that Cyril had become a follower of Luther and he was therefore dangerous to the Church. While in Vlachia Cyril replied to these accusations of Timothy's.(33) His protests, however, were of such a nature, as to confirm Timothy's accusation. "And as for the accusation that I am a Lutheran, it is not to be wondered at that he who neither knows, nor has dreamt of, Luther's religion and wisdom, and does not know in what points the Greek Orthodox Church agrees and

in what it disagrees with the Lutherans, has fallen into a pit."

With the stay of Cyril in Athos is connected a very interesting page of the history of the Greek Church of that time. In the monastery where he stayed he met a boy, 17 years old, from Berroea of Macedonia, by name of Metrophanes Critopoulos. Cyril was deeply impressed by the love of that boy for learning and when he went back to Egypt he took him with him and there he ordained him a priest. At that time Cyril received through the Archbishop of Canterbury Abbot an offer of the King of England James I that he should send to England a few Greek young men who wanted to be educated in theology.(34) Than the boy from Mount Athos Cyril could not desire a better candidate for such a plan. Immediately therefore the young man, who was destined to become a successor of Cyril's on the throne of Alexandria and to adorn the Church with his culture, was speedily despatched to England and early in 1618 Cyril was receiving a letter from Archbishop Abbot, in which this prelate was writing: ".....Your young Metrophanes' name has been inscribed on the roll of the students of the University of Oxford, and when the young plant grows and brings forth good fruit, it will be reserved to your wisdom to decide whether he will remain in this country or will be transplanted to his native land."(35)

It would take us too far afield to follow this remarkable young man's career. Suffice it to say that he justified all the best hopes that Cyril had for him. When he finished his studies in Oxford, Cyril entrusted him with the task of visiting certain parts of Western Europe in order to get better acquainted with the Reformed faith, as it was practiced in those countries and bring back a report. Critopoulos accordingly informed Archbishop Abbot that he would return to Constantinople using the overland route through the Continent and not by ship, at which the Archbishop was infuriated with his former protégé and declared that he would have nothing to do with him in the future. Further he wrote to the English Ambassador in Constantinople, Sir Thomas Roe, giving vent to his disgust

against Critopulos and against the whole nation of the Greeks, whose ingratitude he deplored in very strong terms. Whether the wrath of the Archbishop against Critopulos was roused by his fear, as he himself maintained, lest Critopulos should spend more money by the overland route, or by his jealousy of Critopulos, who, without his assistance, had gained entrance into the Royal Palace and enjoyed the favour of the King, it is hard to tell.(36) Critopulos, however, proceeded to execute Cyril's orders and started on his journey back to Egypt through the Continent. He visited the most important centres of Protestant teaching in Germany and Switzerland, gave lectures in their universities, published at the request of one of their divines a Confession of his faith, and arrived at last in Venice, where he remained <sup>for</sup> some time, having instructions to publish there some of the works of Cyril. In this, however, he was not successful, as he met with the opposition of the Venetian authorities and he sailed for Constantinople, having been away from his homeland for 13 years, and thus he disappears from our narrative. He will make another appearance in it on a very sad occasion after Cyril's death. As the Patriarch of Alexandria he will take part in a solemn action against the memory of his benefactor. But let us not run ahead of our story.

. . . . .

Footnotes to Chapter 3

.....

- (1) A. Leger, "Fragmentum Vitae" in Smith's Collectanea, 79. Smith himself (Collectanea, 13) places this event in 1602 or 1603.
- (2) J.M. Neale "History of the Holy Eastern Church; Patriarch of Alexandria", Vol. II, 358.
- (3) "Some Account of the Present Greek Church", Cambridge 1722, Preface, XI.
- (4) His letter to Uytenbogaert, 10 Oct. 1613, in Aymon, 152.
- (5) G. Mazarakes, "Metrophanes Critopulos", in Greek, 59-66.
- (6) Aymon, 157.
- (7) Aymon, 188-192.
- (8) In his "La Turquie Chretienne sous la puissante protection etc.", 153.
- (9) "Relation of a Journey begun An.Dom. 1610", 114, 115.
- (10) 119-126 passim.
- (11) Φηλ'ιππου Κυπρίου, "Χρονικόν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐκκλησίας", 1687, 447.
- (12) Legrand, IV, 252-3.
- (13) Chr. Papadopoulos, "Cyril Lucaris", 29-30.
- (14) E. Legrand IV, 230-5, 237.
- (15) Hottinger, Analecta Historico-Theologica, 1652, 52.
- (16) Father Simon, "Critical History of the Religions and Customs of the Eastern Nations", 1685, 47.
- (17) Aymon, 142-143.
- (18) No date. Aymon, 172-175.
- (19) No date. Aymon, 175-176.
- (20) No date. Aymon, 193-195.
- (21) No date. Aymon 181-182.
- (22) Aymon, 182, 183.



- (23) I am making use of J.M. Neale's translation from the latin text, in his op.cit. 398-400.
- (24) Aymon 164.
- (25) See his letter to Uyttenbogaert, 10 Oct. 1613, Aymon, 130-164 and the one to De Wilhem, <sup>in</sup> Aymon 177-179.
- (26) Aymon 183-184.
- (27) His letter; 20 March 1618, Aymon 188-192.
- (28) His letter to Uyttenbogaert, 10 Oct. 1613, Aymon, 137-142.
- (29) Chr. Papadopoulos, op.cit., 36.
- (30) Le Quien, op.cit. 330.
- (31) J. Mihalcescu, "Les idées Calvinistes du Patriarch Cyrille Lucaris", in Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse, 1931, 508.
- (32) J. Mihalcescu, *ibid.*; L. Allatius, op.cit., Liber III, 1073-1074.
- (33) Legrand IV, 279-280.
- (34) P. Colomesii, "S. Clementis Epistolae", 346.
- (35) P. Colomesii, op.cit. 349-354.
- (36) See F. H. Marshall, "An Eastern Patriarch's Education in England", in Journal of Hellenic Studies XLVI, 1926, 191-2.

. . . . .

## CHAPTER 4

### On the Ecumenical Throne

" ..... Having been assembled in the Church of the Patriarchate, dedicated to St. George, we proceeded to the election for the vacant holy and high throne of Constantinople ..... and we elected ..... His holiness Cyril, a man famous for his virtue and wisdom." (1) In such terms the Holy Synod in Constantinople, under the chairmanship of the Metropolitan of Heracleia, in conformity to tradition, announced to the christian world the election of Cyril Lucaris to the Ecumenical Throne. (The date of this document, as preserved in Legrand, is 4 November 1620. All other contemporary authorities, however, give the date as November 1621. This appears to be the most probable date. (2)

Cyril's election to the See of Constantinople was too good an opportunity for Allatius's lying tongue to be missed. He therefore invented the story that his predecessor Timothy's death was caused by poison, which Cyril's friend, the Dutch Ambassador in Constantinople served him at a banquet, to which he had invited Timothy, and the throne was thus vacated for Cyril to occupy it. Slanders of this sort against the memory of Cyril and his friends are to be found pretty often in the writings of Allatius. (3)

While still a Patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril had expressed himself with great contempt, as we saw, (4) about the intervention of the Turkish authorities in the election and induction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Of this humiliating state of things Cyril was now to take a personal experience, for his first public action after his election was the payment to the Turkish authorities of the "Peshkesh", a sum of money, without the payment of which



he could not enter upon the duties of his office. This in itself was very humiliating and it was rendered even more humiliating for Cyril by his knowledge that it had been brought about by the pettiness and the narrow-mindedness of the Greeks themselves.

The relations of the Greek Church with the Turkish authorities had not always been of a humiliating character for the former. When Mohamed II conquered Constantinople, he declared as his policy full freedom of conscience for the Greeks and expressed the desire to meet the head of the Greek Church. The Patriarch, however, being dead and no other official of the Church being available, George Scholarius, a man famous for his erudition, was brought before the Sultan, and gave him all information that was required of him about the Greek Church and its practices. So pleased was the Sultan with the answers which Scholarius gave him, that he caused him to be elevated to the vacant office of the Patriarch under the name of Gennadius.(5) The Sultan himself, placed in Gennadius' hands the Pastoral Staff, and gave him the black vest of his office and a white horse. The newly-appointed Patriarch was seated on his white horse and, accompanied by a great number of Turkish officials and representatives of the Greek Church, was led to the Patriarchal Seat.(6) This happy state of things did not last long. Only four Patriarchs, Gennadius, Isidorus, Joasaph and Mark Xilokaravis, enjoyed the privileges granted by Mohamed II. After the fall of Trebizond two rival parties, equally strong, were formed in Constantinople, the old Constantinopolitan and the Trapezuntine. When the Trapezuntines felt themselves sufficiently strong, they strove to place a member of their own party on the Patriarchal throne, and since they could not do it by way of a majority of votes in the Synod, they did it by way of bribery. They sent to the Sultan the sum of one thousand Florins with the request that he should appoint one of their number, Symeon, to be the Patriarch. When the Sultan heard the request,

he laughed, wondering at the stupidity of the Greeks, and he immediately ordered that Symeon should be inducted as Patriarch.(7)

This was the beginning, and things went rapidly from bad to worse. On the one hand the way was opened to the ambition of any party or person within the Greek Church to override by this new method the lawful procedure of appointing the head of the Church. On the other hand this method opened for the Turkish officials a way to exp<sup>l</sup>itation, at a time when venality had very deeply corrupted the Turkish State. The Turkish officials were only too quick to grasp this opportunity. Khotsibeg who lived about the time that Cyril arrived in Constantinople, wrote a work on the causes which brought about the decline of the Ottoman Empire, and attributed it to the increase of venality.(8) Before 1598 nobody could be appointed as a civil servant, unless he first belonged as a "danishmend" or pupil to a "medresse", a college. Shortly afterwards, however, nearly all appointments to the civil service were sold publicly at a fixed price.(9) And in order that the income from this source should be increased, continual changes were being made in the civil service, by having the civil servants dismissed and reappointed, and thus collecting repeatedly the price of their appointment.(10) One should not forget of course that this state of things, so far from being peculiar to Turkey, was in general practice all over Europe, and by the end of the 16th century the sale of offices at fixed prices was the regular method by which the Papal court was running its budget.(11)

At a time, therefore, when the Turkish state had brought to the market all its own civil and ecclesiastical offices, it is not to be wondered at that it was only too eager to turn into good account the narrowmindedness of the officials of the Greek Church. And thus the institution of the Patriarchate, which could be of immense value to the national and civic interests of the Greek people under the Turkish dominion, was almost at the outset rendered useless by the Greeks themselves.



The history of the Patriarchs after Simon the Trapezuntine is a long, almost unrelieved, story of humiliations. Simon himself was not long permitted to stay in office. The Sultan's Greek step-mother, a certain Mrs. Maro, had a favourite monk of her own, whom she wanted to elevate to the Throne of Constantinople. She put therefore two thousand florins in a silver tray and made straight for the Sultan. Needless to say that the silver tray and its contents of gold proved to be a good substitute for the vote of the Holy Synod and forthwith Dionysius, Mrs. Maro's favourite monk, succeeded Simon on the throne.(12) And the bigger the ambitions of the Greek clerics became, the larger the "Peskesh" grew, and the oftener the Turks found the occasion of collecting it. In 1679 e.g. Paul Rycant wrote(13): "In former times the Church paid no more to the Great Signor at the change of a Patriarch, than 10.000 Dollars, but the multitude of pretenders for this office hath enhanced the price to 25.000". A few years later Pitton de Tournefort(14) wrote: "This dignity (i.e. the Ecumenical Throne) is being <sup>sold</sup> to-day for 60.000 dollars". J. Aymon, on the other hand, reports that in 1671, in one and the same year not less than five people, Paissius, Dionysius of Thessalonica, Parthenius, Methodius and Dionysius of Larissa sat, the one after the other, on the throne, having each one of them paid the "Peskesh".(15) Needless to say that the Turkish authorities had good reasons for encouraging as much as they could such a state of things, which could only result in the ruin of the Greek Church.

This state of things was in itself sufficient to make it certain that Cyril would not be long permitted to attend undistracted to the duties of his high office. There were too many petty ambitions at work around him and the Turkish authorities were only too ready to satisfy them. A man, however, of Cyril's stature was sure to make things even more difficult for himself by the very contrast of his personality to the mediocrities around him and the jealousies which that contrast was bound to arouse. And Cyril, it appears, did not make a

particularly great effort to smooth things down, but let his hand fall heavily on the unworthy and lazy clerics which swarmed<sup>in</sup> the Patriarchate. Aymon says:(16) "The majority of the bishops and the priests, being extremely ignorant and being known as such by all those who were acquainted with them, could not suffer a Patriarch so wise and enlightened as Cyril to preside at their meetings and to address to them rebukes in order to oblige them to attend to their Pastoral duties." Ignorance and superstition was one of the greatest foes which Cyril had to fight against all through his adventurous career.

Practically no regular schools were operating at that time among the enslaved Greeks. Then the nation was being bled white by the terrible system of "child-gathering". Every five years small bands of soldiers visited each little Greek community in every part of the Empire and they were empowered by a "firman" which they had in their possession to carry off all male children over seven years old who were distinguished for beauty or cleverness. These were brought up as Moslems and those who were the most promising among them were given every possible opportunity of education, and it was out of the ranks of these renegades that the Turkish Empire got some of its best servants in the highest offices of the state. Thus the blood that was being taken out of the enslaved Greeks was infused to their conquerors to help them wax strong.(17) This "tribute of blood" could not but tell very heavily on the spiritual condition of the nation.

Ignorance was particularly conspicuous among the clergy, with very sad effects. The libraries of even those among them who could read were extremely poor, as their books had to be brought from Venice and they were very expensive.(18) How gross the ignorance of the clergy was can be gathered by the fact that it affected even the traditional interior arrangement of the churches at that time. Tournefort(19) says that when he visited the Levant the pulpit even as a piece of furniture was no longer existing in the majority of churches, "for the custom of preaching was abolished".

We can well imagine how the blood of Cyril boiled when he found himself in the midst of such ignorance and he had to rely on the services of a clergy which in its majority was as much ignorant and superstitious as the people among whom they were working. Tournefort relates(20) how on one occasion he was given hospitality by an old priest who was very anxious to persuade him that he had in his possession a very old prophecy, according to which the Czar of Russia would very soon deliver the Greek nation from the Turkish slavery. The text of the prophecy proved to be the names and other words which the visitors used to inscribe on the stones of the nearby ruins of an ancient building in languages which the old priest could not understand.(21) (Lest, however, we think too hard of the superstition of the old priest, we may remember our enlightened modern British-Israelites and the measurements of the Great Pyramid).

To make things more difficult for the Greek Church, there was operating in Constantinople at the time of Cyril's arrival a Jesuit mission, which had so far very successfully handled two great weapons: the confessional and education. And in this they only repeated in Constantinople what they had consistently and with great success applied in other countries of Europe. Lacy Collison-Morley(22) says about them: "In Europe they cemented their power by the control they obtained both by the confessional and education. .... Their casuistry has become a byword .... There was no crime they could not and did not justify, from regicide downwards, for they held that the end might justify the means." And Ogg(23) affirms the same thing when he says that among earnest seventeenth-century Catholics the view was current that by the application of casuistry in the confessional, the Jesuits were teaching a relaxed morality.

It was exactly along these lines that they achieved their great success in Constantinople. A contemporary of Cyril, Chrysoscule Logothetis, says about them:(24) "Moreover they had attracted to themselves many from the people, i.e. many women and many children, which they could influence more



easily on account of their sex and age..... The women were easily influenced by the eloquence and the sweet manners of these new directors of consciences, who succeeded in making them come to them for auricular confession of their sins, without intimidating them and without obliging them to make rigorous penances or severe fastings.(25)

Even greater, however, was their success by means of the school which they were running in Constantinople for the children of the Greeks. And we are not surprised with their success when we remember that at that time the Jesuits were considered to be the best teachers in Europe. G.N. Clark says:(26) "All Europe admitted at the beginning of the century that in educational practice they were supreme. In discipline, in teaching, in the care of their pupils' health, they were alike successful." "It was through education that they gained their greatest influence in Catholic countries".(27)

With such a past to their credit it is no wonder that their school in Constantinople was a great success ever since it was founded, especially in view of the almost total lack of any means of education among the Greek population at that time.

While he was still in Alexandria, Cyril was following with an anxious eye the progress of the Jesuit school in Constantinople, as witness his letters to his friends at that time. He was writing to Uyttenbogaert, on 10th October 1613(28) "I am the enemy of ignorance..... It is a great dissatisfaction to me that our Pastors and Bishops should be sunk in darkness of ignorance. With this I reproach my countrymen, but without avail. And the Jesuits, taking the opportunity, have laid the foundation of a plan for educating boys at Constantinople, and have as undisputed success as foxes amongst poultry". And in a letter to Archbishop Abbot he was writing:(29) "These emissaries exceedingly terrify us, and impose on our simplicity, and make use of many engines to bring us under their power, trusting chiefly in the show of erudition and the



thorny difficulties of the questions which they raise; while we, meanwhile, labour under a want of learned men, who can oppose these sophists on equal terms."

These clerical "foxes" were having therefore a great success among the "poultry" of Constantinople, and this is not to be wondered at considering the methodical way in which they prepared their "lair". One of their good friends, Leo Allatius(30) describes their college as being spacious and furnished with a rich library, in which they were offering education to the children of the Greeks without collecting any fees whatever. By these means, he says, "they captured the favour of the people". "By means of these children, says the Jesuit Fleuriau, we have reconciled many of their parents and even whole families with the Roman Church."(31)

The whole movement was under the protection of the French ambassador in Constantinople, who acting on instructions given him by his government, more than once used his influence with the Turkish authorities to promote the schemes of his protégés.(32) This of course he did not so much out of religious conviction, as from national motives. Ever since 1536 when Sieur Foret signed as the representative of the King of France Francis I a treaty with Sultan Suleiman I, which was the first of what may be called "modern capitulations", and through which all matters of dispute between Frenchmen and Turks were to be decided only in the presence of the French "dragoman", and further gave them the right of navigation and commerce at the payment of a tax of 5 percent,(33), the French had secured in the Levant a position of absolute preponderance, This was the beginning of the rise of the French commerce in the Near East, as all other nations, with the exception of the Venetians, had to conduct their commercial activities in those parts of the world under the French flag.(34)

There was a clause in that treaty of 1536, which is of particular interest in our present study. According to that clause there was accorded to the French the right of religious liberty and France was given the right of

protection of the Holy Sites in Palestine, which with the passing of time was interpreted to mean the right of protection of all the christians living in the Ottoman Empire and generally in the Levant. George Sandys in his "Relation of a Journey"(35) speaking of his arrival in Alexandria, says, "We lodged in the house of the French consul, unto whose protection al strangers commit themselves."

For some years now, however, the French position in the Levant was declining, on account of the increasing influence of the English and later of the Dutch. Both the English and the Dutch endeavoured to undermine the privileged position which the French were enjoying in Turkey by representing the religion of the French as an idolatrous religion and thus playing with the well-known feelings of the Moslems against anything idolatrous. In the correspondence which was exchanged on this matter between Queen Elizabeth and Mourad III, Elizabeth was taking unto herself the title "The invincible and all powerful Defender of the true Faith, against the idolaters which distorte the teaching of Christ." (36) And it seems that so successful were the agents of Elizabeth in representing to the Turkish authorities the Protestant faith in its "anti-idolatrous" character as being something akin to the Islam(37), that Sinan Pasha was telling on one occasion the Ambassador of the Emperor, "Those English do not lack anything to be real Moslems than to be circumcised and pronounce the 'Eshhed' (i.e. the Moslem Confession of Faith)"(38) However that may be, the English were signing in 1580 a treaty with the Sultan similar to that which had given the French their privileged position.(39) This was the first blow against French prestige in the Levant. The English were not slow in making the best of their newly acquired rights and they contested from the French step by step their privileged position. In 1610, e.g. Sandys(40) says that "there hath bin some contention betweene him (i.e. the English Ambassador) and the French about the protection of the Dutch merchants, but now they do devide the profits." Very soon, however, this convenient agreement and the sharing of the profits came to an end, as in 1612 the Dutch,

through their ambassador in Constantinople Cornelius de Haga, one of Cyril's most faithful friends, in spite of the reaction of the French ambassador Breves de Sacy, signed a treaty of commerce with the Porte similar to that of the French and the English.(41)

Such was the position of the interests of some of the European countries in the Levant at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Cyril's elevation to the See of Constantinople, however, was marked by a decided effort on the part of the French to regain the ground which they had lost to the English and the Dutch. From now on the conduct of French policy is passing into the ambitious hands of Cardinal Richelieu, whose never-swerving aim is to check the power both of Spain and of Austria and build up a position of absolute superiority for France in Europe. Although a Prince of the Church, Richelieu never placed the interests of the Church above the interests of France. In his instructions to Schomberg, his ambassador to Germany, he wrote: "It is a calumny to say that we are so much under the influence of Spain or Rome that we should embrace the interests of either to our own prejudice." And further down he says that Huguenots who were loyal to the King should receive the same favour as Catholics.(42) At the time of Cyril's arrival at Constantinople the Thirty Years' War was in progress, and during its course Richelieu did not scruple to strike an alliance with the Protestants.(43) So much was his policy in international affairs free of ecclesiastical considerations, that that good Roman Catholic writer, L.F. von Pastor(44) says in disgust that Richelieu was "an exponent of Machiavellian policy of might, without scruple or regard for right." Thus it happened that on the Continent of Europe the policy of the Cardinal very often clashed with the interests of the Pope.

In Turdey, however, things were different. In his effort to regain for France the position of superiority which it had enjoyed in earlier days, Rechelieu found that his chief rivals for that position were two Protestant

countries: England and Holland. That was enough for him to place French policy in the Levant in line with the schemes of the Roman church. And thus it came to pass that when Cyril took up his duties as Patriarch of Constantinople he had to reckon not only with the gross ignorance of the majority of the Greek clergy and the petty ambitions of the bishops; not only with the cruel warfare which the Roman Church with a determined hand took up against him; but also with the powerful opposition of the French authorities both at home and in the Levant, which saw in the person of Cyril not so much a spiritual leader working hard for the awakening of his people, as an instrument in the hands of Sir Thomas Roe and Cornelius de Haga, the ambassadors of the two powers which contested with France the position of influence. It was a pity that so many factors combined to resist the first breath of Reformation which Cyril <sup>had</sup> brought to Constantinople.

. . . . .



Footnotes to Chapter 4.

. . . . .

- (1) Legrand, IV, 340-342.
- (2) Vide: Philippi Cyprii, "Chronicon Ecclesiae Graecae", Franquerae, MDCLXXIX, 17-20; Thomas Smith, "Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucaris", London 1707, 22; Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus", Vol. I, 331-332.
- (3) Leo Allatius, "De Ecclesiae Occidentalis et Orientalis etc.", Liber III, 1074-1075.
- (4) Letter to Uyttenbogaert 10 Oct. 1613, in Aymon 161.
- (5) Crusius, "Turgograecia", Leber II, 107-108.
- (6) Paul Rycaut, "The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches", London 1679, 95-97.
- (7) M. Crusius, op.cit. Liber **ii**, 124, 125.
- (8) See Finlay, History of Greece, Vol. V, 47.
- (9) Hammer, "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman", French Translation by J.J. Hellert, Vol. VIII, 46.
- (10) Ranke, "History of the Ottoman Empire in the 16th and 17th Centuries", 17.
- (11) Finlay, op.cit. V, 49.
- (12) Crusius, op.cit., Liber II, 126, 127.
- (13) Op. cit., 107.
- (14) "Relation d'un Voyage du Levant, 1700", Lyons, 1727, 118.
- (15) Paul Trivier, "Cyrille Lucar", 14.
- (16) "Monuments authentiques de la Religion de Grecs", 1708, 65.
- (17) Christophorus Angelus, "Status et Ritus Ecclesiae Graecae", Francofurti, MDCLV, 12-14; E. Ranke, "The Ottoman Empire in the 16th and 17th Centuries", 6-21 passim; G. Finlay, "History of Greece", Vol. V 4, 39-41.

- (18) Pitton de Tournefort, op.cit., I, 123.
- (19) op.cit. I, 137.
- (20) op.cit. I, 84.
- [ (21) Lest, however, we think too hard of the superstition of the old priest, we may remember our enlightened modern British-Israelites and the measurements of the Great Pyramid. ]
- (22) "Italy after the Renaissance", 120-121.
- (23) "Europe in the 17th Century", 91, 343-344.
- (24) "Narration Historique des troubles que les Jesuites susciterent a Constantinople", in Aymon 203-204.
- (25) See also "Narration Epistolica Turbarum inter Cyrillum Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum et Jesuitas", in Smith's Collectanea, 85-86; Zottos: "Les Jesuites a Constantinople", in "Union Chretienne" 1868, 85.
- (26) "The Seventeenth Century", 302.
- (27) A.J. Grant, "A History of Europe from 1494 to 1610", 284. See also Lacy Collison-Morley, op.cit. 121; A.H. Johnson, "Europe in the 16th Century", 265; Th. Griesinger, "The Jesuits, 48-52, 147; L. Ranke, "The Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries", 172-3, 415-416.
- (28) Aymon 161.
- (29) Aymon, op.cit. 44-48; P. Colomesii, S. Clementis Epistolae, 346.
- (30) Op.cit. 1069.
- §1) As quoted by Zottos, op.cit. 86; see also Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 202-204.
- (32) See Hammer, op.cit., Vol. VIII, 165-166.
- (33) J.T. Bent, Introduction to the volume published by the Hakluyt Society for the year 1893, preface, IV; M.A. Rambaud, in "Lavissee et Rambaud, "Histoire Generale", Vol. IV, 738.
- (34) Lavissee et Rambaud, op.cit. Vol. V, 877.

- (35) p. 115
- (36) See Hammer, op.cit., Vol. VII, 140, 141.
- (37) A.J. Grant, "A History of Europe from 1494 to 1610", 226.
- (38) Hammer, op.cit., Vol. VII, 251-252.
- (39) Lavissee et Rambaud, op.cit. Vol. V, 879-880.
- (40) op.cit. 85.
- (41) Baudier, Inventaire de l'Histoire generale des Turcs, 761; Hammer op.cit., Vol. VIII, 192.
- (42) J.B. Perkins, "Richelieu",...
- (43) Leopold Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries", Vol. II, 242-244.
- (44) History of the Popes, Vol. XXVIII, 67-68.

. . . . .

## CHAPTER 5.

### Beginning of Troubles.

As soon as Cyril took his residence in Constantinople he felt that his most urgent duty was to take measures in order to neutralize the danger which the activities of the Jesuits constituted for the Church. And in this he was not alone. It seems that there were both among the Bishops and the influential laymen those who had not fallen victims to the Roman intrigues and these were one with Cyril in believing that the activities of the Jesuits should by all means be checked. They did not dare, however, to take open action against them, as they did not want to provoke an open warfare with the French Embassy, which would certainly exert all the influence it had over the Porte to make mischief. With all possible precautions, therefore, they began in private conversations warning the people against the Jesuit guiles.(1)

Even this conservative action, however, was too much for the Jesuits, who immediately reacted. When exactly the troubles began it is difficult to state, as our sources do not agree with each other. A. Leger, in his "Fragmentum Vitae"(2) says that Cyril was permitted to attend to his duties without any disturbance for two and a half years, which would take his first exile to Rhodes as far down as the spring or summer of 1624. Philippus Cyprius, on the other hand,(3) reduces the time between Cyril's accession to the throne and his first exile to one year and thus places his exile towards the end of 1622. This date is corroborated by Father Simon(4) and Le Quien,(5) both of whom place Cyril's first exile in the year 1622. That Leger's date is untenable is further shown by the minutes of a meeting of the "Propaganda Fidei" in Rome,



on 27th June 1623(6) from which it appears that the news of Cyril's deposition from the Throne and his condemnation to exile was already known in Rome. Considering the slow pace at which news were travelling at that time - we shall come very soon across another case in which news from Constantinople were very late in reaching the "Propaganda Fidei" - it is quite safe to place the exile to Rhodes towards the end of 1622, and the beginning of the troubles which led to it, earlier in the year.

According to Chrysoscule Logothetis(7) the first troubles broke out in February 1622. The Jesuits, having the support of the French ambassador, attempted to chase Cyril out of his throne and install in his place another Greek, who would be willing to recognise the rule of the Pope over the whole Church and submit himself to his jurisdiction. That they had the open support of the French ambassador at this early stage is well attested. Dom. Alphonse Guepin(8) says that "the presence of this Calvinist on the Patriarchal Throne was a matter of great anxiety for the French court, and both from religious motives and for the sake of political interests Ces#y (the French ambassador in Constantinople) was keeping him under close observation and was doing everything in his power to overthrow him."

It is not quite clear, however, what form this first attempt against Cyril took. It appears more probable that the French Ambassador and his missionary friends decided not to make use of the Porte before they were sure that they could base no hopes on the Greek Church itself to help them. They started, therefore, an agitation within the Church. And they would not lack supporters in this, as there was at that time within the Greek Church an influential and growing Romanising party. This party had chiefly its origin in the College of St. Athanasius which the Pope Gregory XIII founded in Rome in 1577 for the education of Greek young men.(9) Needless to say that this College was meant to be a means of propaganda, and a powerful instrument indeed it proved to be in the hands of

the Roman Church. Peter Arcudios, Leo Allatius, Matthew Cariophiles, Peter Stavrinis, Cannachio Rossi, Athanasius the Rhetorician, Nicephorus Melissinos were only a few of the graduates of the College who had turned Roman Catholics, in Cyril's own time.(10) All these men spared no efforts in propagating the Roman faith within the Greek Church. And they were very successful, for as a result of their efforts there arose within the Church a party, which while outwardly retained their allegiance to the Greek Orthodox Church, at heart they were Catholics and they were ready to bring the Church under the rule of the Pope, in accordance with the terms of the Synod of Florence, and thus repeat in Greece what had only a few years ago happened in Poland. How influential this party was can be gathered from the fact that only a few years before Cyril the See of Constantinople was occupied by a graduate of the College of St. Athanasius, Raphael II (16-3-1608),<sup>0</sup>(11) who did everything in his power to promote the Roman plans in the Near East. This party, it appears, convoked a Synod in Constantinople which after having examined the accusations that were circulated against Cyril as favouring Calvinism, deposed him.

Thus Allatius expressly says(12) that after Cyril had sat on the Throne for four months, during which he "was professing the Catholic faith"(!), he began disseminating his heretical ideas, and a Synod was called together to take measures against him. That about this time Cyril began to be widely known as holding Calvinist views can be seen from a letter of the English ambassador Sir Thomas Roe to the Archbishop Abbot: "As for the Patriarch himself, I do not doubt but that in opinion of religion he is, as we term him, a pure Calvinist, and so the Jesuits in these parts do brand him."(13)

Whether a Synod was really held is open to question, as it is attested only by Allatius(as above), Father Simon(14) and Nicolaus Comneni Papadopoli(15), all three fierce enemies of Lucaris, while Le Quien, a Roman Catholic of a more conservative temperament does not mention any Synod having been assembled. The

result of the agitation, however, was the attempt to have Cyril deposed and another man elevated in his place. This man Chrysoscule Logothetis leaves unnamed, but it appears from other sources that he was Gregory of Amassia, who for being blind of the one eye, was popularly known as "Stravoamassias", "the blind bishop of Amassia.(16)

When Cyril was confronted with this situation, he immediately took counsel with his friends and it was decided that they should try and keep this affair as strictly as possible within the church and thus avoid the interference of outsiders. Accordingly on the following Sunday Cyril preached in the Cathedral a sermon in which he made known to the public the plots that had been made against him, taking care not to mention the Jesuits by name but to indicate them in vague terms, and he warned his flock to be on their guard. After this, acting together with four archbishops and a large number of clergy he pronounced the sentence of excommunication against the bishop who <sup>had</sup> attempted to supplant him, hoping that this display of severity would discourage others who might have similar ambitions.(17)

These measures, so far from discouraging the Jesuits, they irritated them all the more. These enemies of Cyril saw that they would have to make use of the Turkish authorities, in order to have him cast out of his office. As soon, therefore, as they were able to secure the services of the suitable mediating persons, they approached the Grand Vizir. Among those who took an active part in the effort to approach the Turkish authorities, Leger names(18) a certain Archimandrite Euthymius, who apparently had received the promise of Rome that he would succeed Cyril on the throne. For some reason, however, the promise was not fulfilled and Euthymius was obliged to leave Constantinople and take his residence in Rome, where we find him after some years offering his counsels to the "Propaganda Fidei" in their warfare against Cyril.

The Grand Vizir at that time was a certain Hussein Pasha from Epirus, to

whom the Jesuits came, supported by the French Embassy, with the double accusation against Cyril that he was exchanging correspondence with the Great Duke of Russia and that he incited the inhabitants of one of the islands of the Aegean sea to rebellion with the aim of making it possible for the Florentines to occupy that island. These accusations the Jesuits accompanied with a promise of twenty thousand dollars, should Cyril be expelled from his throne. This promise would in itself be sufficient for the promotion of the Jesuits' plans, considering the character of Hussein Pasha. It is interesting, however, to see how carefully the Jesuits selected their ground in their effort to rouse the suspicions of the Turkish authorities against Cyril. At this particular time a war against Poland, which had an unfortunate end for Turkey, had just been concluded or, probably, <sup>had</sup> was in its last stages.(19) This <sup>had</sup> created a very delicate state of things, so far as Russia was concerned, and eventually led to the deposition and the murder of Sultan Osman II. At such a time anyone exchanging correspondence with important people in Russia would naturally come under grave suspicions. Cyril admitted that that correspondence was indeed exchanged, but he added that this was done at the express desire of the Grand Vizir, the predecessor of Hussein Pasha. All his protests, however, did not avail to persuade the Vizir of his innocence.

The other accusation against Cyril was equally well selected. The attacks of the Florentines against the Turkish coasts and islands during the last thirty years had become a source of increasing annoyance for the Porte,(20) and things were to be brought to a climax soon after Cyril's exile, when the Forte was obliged to take the initiative in establishing better relations with Florence.(21) At such a time, therefore, even to mention the name of Florence in connection with somebody would be sufficient to place him under the most sinister suspicions. Vainly did Cyril protest that he was innocent. Hussein Pasha was adamant. Forthwith the sentence against Cyril was pronounced that



he should be banished to the island of Rhodes. Both Leger and Smith(22) find a most fitting divine retribution in the fact that before long Hussein Pasha was himself strangled by order of the Sultan in that same cell of the Prison of the "Seven Towers", in which he had thrown Cyril as a prisoner.

So to Rhodes Cyril was sent, that most beautiful of the islands of the Aegean, "beloved of the Sun and erected above the waves by his powerful influence"(23) He did not stay here long, however, because the situation in Constantinople did not develop in the way in which the Jesuits had hoped it would. At any rate by the first of September of 1623 Cyril was back in Constantinople.(24)

The throne, having been rendered vacant by Cyril's departure, was filled by the "bishop of one eye", Gregory of Amassia, who was willing to act as an instrument in the hands of the Roman propaganda and who, according to Allatius,(25) if he is to be relied on, by means of letters which he sent to the Pope, declared publicly his submission to the Roman See. Gregory's tenure of the office did not last, however, long; only ten weeks.(26) The Greek population of Constantinople adopted towards the unexpected occupant of the Throne an attitude of passive opposition. They did not recognize him as their Pastor, did not attend ~~attend~~ the services at the Cathedral, did not congratulate him on his "promotion", and, what was worse, they refused to furnish the money, on which the Jesuits had counted for the fulfilment of their promise to Hussein Pasha and the payment of the inevitable "Peshkesh". Thus, as the time passed and no solution of the financial problem appeared, poor Gregory ran the risk of being considered as having defrauded the Turkish treasury and being sent to prison.(27) He was not, therefore, hard to be persuaded to resign in favour of another man, whom the Jesuits brought to the scene as a candidate for the Ecumenical Throne, Anthimus of Adrin<sup>a</sup>ople.(28)

Anthimus was not as desirable a person for the Jesuits as Gregory was. He was a man of no great merits and (a man) of weak character, but he had one great merit which qualified him as the man of the hour - he was a man of ample means and could provide the money which the Jesuits so urgently needed for the fulfilment of their promise to the Grand Vizir. They therefore appealed to him, and he was quite willing to pay for the honour of sitting on the Throne.

He was not, however, much more fortunate than his predecessor. For in the meantime the friends of Cyril succeeded in having him <sup>called</sup> ~~revoked~~ from the exile and as soon as the news was spread in Constantinople that Cyril had come back, the house in which he was staying was flooded by friends who came to congratulate him on his safe return. The news was not long in reaching the Patriarchal Residence and terror struck at the heart of old Anthimus when he learnt that the lawful Pastor of the Church was back and the people had extended him a warm welcome. Immediately he made up his mind. Secretly he made his way to the house where Cyril was staying and offered to him his resignation. Cyril did not dare to occupy the Throne without first obtaining the permission of the Turkish authorities, but he asked Anthimus to abide by his resignation, so that the Throne might be vacant up to the time when the Turkish authorities would make up their mind about his rights on it. This Anthimus promised to do. And at this point things took a most unexpected turn. The whole story of Cyril and the Ecumenical Throne is a sad story of humiliations which culminated in tragedy. Just for once, however, the story is enlivened by a comic element, and one really doesn't know whether he should shed tears or laugh with the unexpected adventure of old Anthimus.

As soon as the French ambassador learnt of Anthimus' defection, he invited him to the Embassy and there by means of promises of the protection of the Pope and the King of France, as well as by means of threats, he persuaded

the old man to revoke his resignation. Without delay a procession was formed. The "dragomans" of the French Embassy - very important people at that time of "capitulations" - together with a detachment of <sup>3</sup>Yannissaries, started from the French Embassy, having Anthimus in their midst, and made their way slowly for Galata in order to restore Anthimus in his office. By the time they reached the Church of the Patriarchate they were a large procession and the whole city rang with the news. The hero of this exciting scene, however, was not at all happy with his triumph. His conscience was troubled and his spirit was heavy with fears. He knew that he had no rights on the Throne and he knew that he had wronged the lawful Pastor of the Church. As soon, therefore, as he could escape the vigilance of the "dragomans" who had orders to grant him the protection of the King of France even against his own will, he came by night to Cyril, cast himself at his mercy, besought his pardon and having made sure that the Patriarch had forgiven him retired to Mount Athos, in one of the monasteries of which he spent the remaining days of his life.(29)

There remained now for Cyril only to obtain the Grand Vizir's permission to resume his duties, and this was not too difficult to get, provided the "Peshkesh" was once again paid. This the Greek Church was obliged to do and thus was the first round of Cyril's adventures with the Roman Church ended. He was once again on the Throne, and this time, although adventures of a relatively minor importance were not lacking, he was permitted to attend to his duties for a period of eight years.

. . . . .

Footnotes to Chapter 5.

. . . . .

- (1) Chrysoscule Logothetis, in Aymon 204.
- (2) In Smith's Collectanea, 80.
- (3) "Chronicon Ecclesiae Graecae", 17-20.
- (4) "The Critical History of the Religions and Customs of the Eastern Nations", 48-49.
- (5) "Oriens Christianus", Vol. I, 332.
- (6) Published by G. Hoffmann, S.I., in "Orientalia Christiana", No. 52, May 1929, 46.
- (7) op.cit. 204.
- (8) "Un Apôtre de l'Union des Eglises au XVII Siecle", Paris 1897, 347.
- (9) Allatius, op.cit. Lib. III, 985-9; Ranke, "History of the Popes", Vol. I, 322-3, 433; von Pastor, "History of the Popes" XIX, 239 ff.; B.J. Kidd, "The Counter-Reformation", 180.
- (10) A. Diamantopoulos, "Cyril Lucaris", (in Greek), 37.
- (11) L. Allatius, op.cit. Lib. III, 989.
- (12) Op.cit. Liber III, 1074-1075.
- (13) As quoted by Hammer, op.cit. VIII, 345.
- (14) op.cit. 48-49.
- (15) "Historia Cymnasii Patavini", Vol. II, 294
- (16) Smith, op.cit. 25.
- (17) Logothetis Chrysoscule, in Aymon 205; "Narratio Epistolica Turbarum", in Smith's Collectanea 87.
- (18) "Fragmentum Vitae" in Smith's Collectanea, 81.
- (19) Hammer, op.cit. Vol. VIII, 273-321.
- (20) Cf. Hammer, op.cit. VII 362-363, VIII, 16-17, 168-202.
- (21) Hammer, op.cit. IX, 33.



- (22) Collectanea 26 and 81.
- (23) G. Sandys, "Relation of a Journey", 90-92 passim.
- (24) Chrysoscule Logothetis, ~~Collectanea~~ *Agave*, 207.
- (25) op.cit. Liber III, 1069.
- (26) See Smith, op.cit. 27; Philippus Cyprius, op.cit. 19 says "menses tres".
- (27) Smith, op.cit. 27.
- (28) Chrysoscule Logothetis, in ~~Collectanea~~ *Agave*, 206; "Narratio Epistolica Turbarum", 88.
- (29) *Chrysoscule Logothetis, as above; Le Quien, op.cit. I, 333; Smith, "Collectanea", 30.*

. . . . .

## CHAPTER 6.

"In Perils from my own Countrymen....."

The slow pace with which news was travelling at that time was responsible for a great disappointment which Rome received in connection with its efforts to get rid of Lucaris. Some time in 1624 the French ambassador in Constantinople De Cessy was receiving a letter from the Pope, which he must have read with a sense of bitter irony. "The Roman Church hath heard what thou hast done in Constantinople and praised thy piety. We know what calamities have befallen that son of the darkness, that athlete of the hell, the pseudo-patriarch Cyril, and that thou hast taken care that the venerable Father Anthimus should become the leader of the church." (1)

One can imagine the disappointment of the sender of this congratulatory letter, when shortly after its despatch it was made known in Rome that "the son of the darkness and athlete of hell" was back in Constantinople since last year and at the head of the church once again, while the "venerable Father Anthimus" in the quiet of one of the monasteries of Mount Athos and at a safe distance from the protection of the French Ambassador was meditating on the vanity of human things. The bitterness of the disappointment, however, must have spurred Rome to take new decisions against Cyril, for soon after the despatch of the above letter successive waves of activity of a Roman origin reached Constantinople. These waves all emanated from the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide", to which belongs the sad honour of having prosecuted with an untiring determination the Roman plans against Cyril to their tragic end.

It must be placed among the factors that conspired against Cyril and his work, that his effort to reform the Greek Church falls in at a time when the revived "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide" gave new vitality to the efforts to conquer for the Roman Church the Orthodox East.

Gregory XIII, the Pope who, as we have, seen founded in Rome the College of St. Athanasius for the education of Greek young men, was also responsible for another measure which had as its aim the conversion of the Greek East to the Roman faith, namely the founding, in 1573, of a Congregation for the spread of the Faith in the East. This was the forerunner of the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide" which was brought into being by the Pope Gregory XV, on Epiphany day of 1622, i.e. exactly two months after Cyril was elevated to the Throne of Constantinople. Both Gregory XV and his Secretary of State, Ludovisi, had intimate knowledge of, and sincere admiration for the centralised organisation of the Society of Jesus and by the creation of the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide" they endeavoured to place the Roman Catholic missions all the world over under one central authority, with a view of coördinating their activities and securing better results for their labours.(2) Thus it was that the fight against Cyril passed into the hands of the "Congregatio", which, to the very end, kept itself responsible for its conduct. And one may gather the importance which Rome attached to the fight against Cyril from the fact that, whereas it was laid down in the chart of the foundation of the Congregatio that "only the most important matters were to be brought before the Pope"(3), more than once meetings in which measures to be taken against Cyril were discussed, were presided over by the Pope himself.

Our authorities disagree between themselves on the time at which the first measures of the "Congregatio" against Cyril were taken. Our older sources, T. Smith,(4) and Chrysoscule Logothetis,(5) place this beginning of hostilities in the month of February 1624. But the minutes of the meetings of the "Congregatio" which were published by G. Hofmann, S.I.(6) show that this event must be placed a year later. In the meantime, however, news of a most disquieting nature was reaching the "Propaganda". Von Pastor(7) mentions the fact that it was made known in Rome that Cyril had printed at Wittenberg a

catechism written by one of his pupils called Zacharias, destined to spread Protestant ideas among the Greeks.

Zacharias Gerganos, whom no doubt von Pastor has in mind, is not known to have been a pupil of Cyril's. He was contemporary with, but younger than Cyril. Belonging to a noble family of Epirus, he was taken under the protection of the King of Saxony and he studied theology in the University of Wittenberg from 1619 to 1622. While in Wittenberg, he published a new edition of the New Testament. He also prepared a "Christian Catechism" which he published in Wittenberg in 1622.(8) This Catechism has definite Protestant tendencies and, as it made its appearance soon after Cyril was elected Patriarch of Constantinople, it seems that he gave it a cordial welcome, as a book useful for his own efforts to reform the Greek Church, and he had it circulated in Constantinople and this probably gave rise to the rumour that it was himself who published the Catechism. At any rate in his letter of 1st October 1624 to his Government in Paris the French Ambassador was complaining that "numerous Calvinistic Catechisms in handwriting" were circulating in Constantinople through the initiative of the Patriarch.(9)

However this may have been, the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide" was feeling very uneasy about Cyril and considered his presence in Constantinople as an obstacle to the realization of its own plans. These fears were strengthened in the course of time by letters which Schiattini, who subsequently became Roman Catholic bishop of Naxos, was sending to the "Congregatio" and in which he was giving reports of the calvinistic activities of Cyril in Constantinople.(10) At the outset the "Propaganda" endeavoured to secure in its struggle against Cyril the assistance of the Roman Catholic Court of Vienna, while at the same time, by letters to the French Ambassador De Cesy, they encouraged him to persevere in his zeal for the Roman faith. They were not satisfied, however, in simply urging the French Ambassador to take all



possible measures against Cyril, but as soon as they were informed of the return of Cyril to the throne of Constantinople they wrote a letter to the Apostolic Nuncio in Paris(11) in which the Nuncio was requested to ask the King of France, to take under his high protection the Patriarchate of Constantinople and to write to his ambassador in Constantinople to bring to bear all his influence in order to have Cyril deposed from the throne. The Nuncio was asked to make it known to the King that, were that Calvinist permitted to soil Greece with his teaching and ultimately to bring about a union of his own Church with the Calvinist synagogue of the West, which was the definite aim both of himself and his Dutch friends, the Catholic Church would be confronted with new enemies. This would create a very serious situation and the Nuncio was asked to do everything in his power to have the King of France personally interested in the matter of Lucaris.

In January 1625 the vanguard of the Roman forces arrived in Constantinople, in the shape of a monk, who was given hospitality at the French Embassy. This monk came from Rome with a special message from the "Propaganda Fide" to all the friends of Rome within the Greek Church, to tell them not to lose courage, as money would not be lacking in their efforts against Lucaris, but very soon a sum of twenty thousand dollars would be available from Rome, provided only they could secure the deposition of Cyril and the elevation in his place of some other bishop about whose friendly attitude to Rome there could be no doubt.(12)

This first movement of Rome was rapidly followed by the despatch of three different emissaries, all of whom, in a different way each one of them, had as their aim to help overthrow Cyril. First to arrive on the field was a certain Greek Jesuit, Berillus by name, whose special mission was to accuse Cyril to the Turkish authorities that, by letters and otherwise, he was inciting the Cosacks<sup>5</sup> to take up the arms against the Empire. Once again one cannot help

admiring the masterly way in which Rome chose its ground against its enemy. For a long time now the Cosacks with their incursions against various parts of the Empire, had been the chief obstacle to the conclusion of peace between Turkey and Russia(13) and only a year before the arrival of Berillus in Constantinople the Cosacks had attempted their most terrible invasion so far, when in July 1624 a flotilla of about a hundred and fifty light vessels made its appearance at the northern entrance of the Bosphorus and, having laid waste its <sup>A</sup>asiatic coast, retired.(14) In such an atmosphere, for one to be in touch with the Cosacks was a crime which would be impossible for him to atone for, as Th. Smith put it(15), "even if he could shed a thousand times his life."

The second emissary, an unnamed layman, came with the instructions to prepare the way for a treaty being concluded between Turkey and Spain(16), in which case it would be easier, no doubt, by making use of the good services of the Catholic state, to secure the assistance of the Turkish authorities against Cyril.

Last, but not the least, arrived on the scene another Greek proselyte of Rome, Cannachio Rossi, a graduate of the College of St. Athanasius, who had instructions to approach Cyril himself with definite proposals from the Holy Father. He was instructed(17) to give Cyril the assurance that the Roman Church always desired to be in peace and have union with all churches, and above all with the Greek Church, which in times past had received the good services of ~~her~~ Catholic sister. And not only in past times, but more recently, during the patriarchate of Jeremiah, the Roman Church had done everything in its power to bring about a union with the Greek, having spared neither pains nor money for this purpose. One proof of its feelings of friendship towards the Greek Church was the foundation of a College in Rome for the education of the young Greeks, so that a nation so noble and industrious might regain, through piety and education, the place that in past times it held.

As regards more especially the present Patriarch of Constantinople, the Sovereign Pontiff, whose benevolent feelings for the Greek Church are <sup>so</sup> intense, would gladly spend immense sums of money for the purpose of reuniting with the body of the Roman Church such a noble member and of giving a special assistance to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Supposing, however, that the rumours which had come from Constantinople are true, the Pope does not see how this union could be effected. He has the information e.g., that the Patriarch rejects the Invocation of the Saints, the worship and veneration of the Images and Relics of the Saints, the real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, the Free Will, the authority of the Councils, the Traditions, the authority of the Holy Fathers, the need for auricular confession. The Pope is also being informed that the Patriarch of Constantinople is sending young men to study in the University in England, where they are being taught this erroneous doctrine, which they are disseminating all over the East. That for this same purpose he is himself distributing to the bishops some sort of a Catechism, which he has printed, and which is full of errors that have been condemned not only by the Apostolic See and the Council of Trent, but also by his own predecessors. That the ambassador of the Huguenots are giving him their approval and that he shows no scruple in communicating with them. That he has lifted the "Synodicon" and no longer bows the knee before the Holy Eucharist.

The instructions given to Rossi went on to say that the Holy Father would earnestly wish that all these rumours are without foundation and that the Patriarch, as the leader of such a noble nation, has been such, as the spiritual and temporal needs of his people demand, so that the Holy Father may be able to show him favour and give him, with a good conscience, a real and effective assistance.

If, therefore, these rumours are baseless and the Patriarch is in a position to prove to His Holiness that he is innocent, he should inform according-

ly the French Ambassador or the Ambassador of the Emperor and give them good proofs about his innocence. He should also send to His Holiness through the above ambassadors a Confession of his faith, in which he should accept the Council of Florence and condemn the errors of the Calvinists and the Lutherans; after which the Holy See will not fail to accord him its favour and to assist the Church of Constantinople in every possible way, so that it should regain its proper place among the Churches dependent on her. His Holiness will not impose either on Cyril or on the other Greek bishops any other conditions than those which have been decreed by the Council of Florence, provided the Greek Church condemns and anathematizes, as she has done up to now, the blasphemies of the heresiarchs of the North, such as the Lutherans and the Calvinists.

Such was the message which Cannachio Rossi was charged to deliver to Cyril on behalf of the Pope and the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide".

The first result of Rossi's arrival in Constantinople was that the French ambassador De Cesy took offence, as he was anxious to keep the initiative in the handling of the whole matter in his own hands. He therefore wrote to Rome and demanded Rossi's recall. The "Congregatio", however, although it decided to leave the negotiations on this matter in the experienced hands of De Cesy, refused to recall Rossi and thus the latter presented Rome's ultimatum to Cyril.

For an ultimatum it was; Cyril could not make any mistake about it. Behind the language of politeness which, for the time being, Rome adopted and the compliments <sup>which</sup> she paid to the "son of darkness and athlete of hell", it would be easy for the latter to see that Rome would be satisfied with nothing less than a complete surrender of himself and the Greek Church to Rome. Cyril was placed in a difficult position, for such a surrender he could not of course make; on the other hand he knew that his refusal would raise a new tempest against him. He had long deliberations with his friends, sepecially the English and Dutch



ambassadors, and at last he adopted the course of action which Sir Thomas Roe suggested to him, namely not to give any answer to the Roman proposals, seeing, that these were not given him in writing.(18)

This attitude of prudence highly displeased the Jesuits, who having realized that they could hope nothing from Cyril himself, resorted once again to violence against him. Once again they made use of the Latinizing party of the Church, which they tried to persuade, by means of a promise of twenty thousand dollars, to take action against Cyril with a view of overthrowing him and replacing him by one of their own number.

The horizon once again began to darken. The charge which had been made against Cyril, in connection with the Cosácks, together with the possibility of a promise being made to the Turks for a new "peshkesh" did not forebode anything good for Cyril. He therefore retired in his own house, avoiding all public appearance, while his good friends, the English and Dutch ambassadors approached the Turkish authorities and revealed to them the sinister plans of the Roman emissaries against Cyril, and thus cleared the situation. It would be against the Turks' own nature, however, were they to be persuaded about Cyril's innocence, however manifest that may have been, without the assistance of bribery. The ambassadors, therefore, sealed their arguments by the offer of a sum of ten thousand dollars, and this helped the Turkish authorities to see that Cyril was quite innocent of the charges made against him. This gave Cyril and his church a respite, before the next Roman wave reached the shores of Constantinople.

And a good use Cyril made of this respite. He saw that so long as ignorance about the great christian doctrines prevailed among the Greek people and especially among the clergy, there could be no hope of the Greek Church resisting the attacks of Rome. He invited therefore various learned men to come and settle in Constantinople and help him in his work.(19) Chief of them was Theophilus Corydalleus. In connection with the Patriarchate there

had been founded recently in Constantinople a school, whose purpose was to react against the school of the Jesuits. Very much of course depended from the man who would be in charge of this school, and Cyril gave one more evidence of the theological position which he held at that time by the choice which he made for that responsible office. He asked the famous Theophilus Corydalleus, who was at that time headmaster of a school in the island of Zante, to come and take charge of the school of Constantinople. Corydalleus was famous for his erudition - like Cyril himself, he had studied in Padua under Cyril's own teacher Cremonini, and this may have been a reason for deciding Cyril in his favour. The strongest reason, however, which must have influenced Cyril in his choice, was that Corydallues was also famous for the definitely Calvinist views which he held in matters of theology.(20) When Corydalleus, therefore, arrived in Constantinople, Cyril could feel sure that the education of the young in Constantinople was in the hands of a man who held the same beliefs, as he did, and shared with him the desire to see the Greek Chruch reformed.

. . . . .

Footnotes to Chapter 6.

. . .

- (1) Codinus, "De officiis et officialibus Curiae et Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae" ed. Jac. Goar, 421.
- (2) Von Pastor, "History of the Popes", XXVII 16-17, 129-143.
- (3) Von Pastor, *ibid.*
- (4) "Collectanea", 31.
- (5) "Narration Historique" 210.
- (6) See "Orientalia Christiana", No. 52, May 1929, 35-36; also von Pastor, *op. cit.* XXIX, 229.
- (7) *Op. cit.* XXIX, 228.
- (8) Legrand, IV, 159; A.C. Demetracopoulos, "Orthodox Greece", 149-150; "De vita et scriptis Metrophanis Critopuli", 15-16; C. Sathas, "Modern Greek Literature", 308-309.
- (9) E. Hurmuzaki, 225.
- (10) Von Pastor, *op. cit.* XXIX, 228.
- (11) 16 December 1623; in "Lettere della Congregazione: Lettere volgari", vol.3: 34r-34v, as quoted by Hoffmann, "Orientalia Christiane", No. 52, 47-48.
- (12) Chrysoscule Logothetis, *op. cit.* 209; Th. Smith, "Collectanea", 31.
- (13) Hammer, *op. cit.*, VII, 185-189, VIII, 147, 206, 217-218, 249 etc.
- (14) Hammer, *op. cit.* IX, 28, 54-56.
- (15) "Collectanea", 31.
- (16) Smith, "Collectanea", 31.
- (17) For the instructions which were given to Cannachio Rossi, see T. Roe, "Negotiations in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, 1621-8", London 1740, 470 sq.; Chrysoscule Logothetis, *op. cit.* 211-214; Smith, "Collectanea", 32.
- (18) Smith, "Collectanea", 32; Chrysoscule Logothetis, 214.

(19) A.C. Demetracopoulos, "De Vita et Scriptis Metrophani Critopuli", 9.

(20) C. Sathas, Modern Greek Literature, 250-260; A.C. Demetracopoulos, "Orthodox Greece", 157-158; Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, "Historia Gymnasii Patavini", II, 298-299. This last writer gives by mistake to Corydalleus as his christian name not Theophilus, but Nicephorus.

. . . . .



## Chapter 7.

The "Congregatio" gets angry.

In one of the two niches which are on either side of the altar of the apse of St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome, there stands a beautiful statue made by the great Bernini. The statue represents a man with <sup>a</sup> long beard cut square, the "bella barba", a big forehead and thick brows, under which there shine two eyes full of pride and power.(1) Up his robe, on the statue, are climbing a few bees, the emblem of the House of Barberini, and the bountiful way in which the Pope Urban VIII, for he it is whom the statue represents, provided for his kinsmen at the expense of the public funds gave rise to the saying: "Quam bene pavit apes, tam male pavit oves" - "he has fed his sheep as badly, as he has fed his bees well".(2)

By common consent <sup>U</sup>rban VIII was the greatest Pope of the 17th Century,(3) and he was fully conscious of his merits. "I do not know of any Pope in whom this self-consciousness attained to so high a degree". "Self-reliant and self-willed, he kept the management of affairs altogether in his own hands." These are the verdicts on him of a Protestant and a Roman Catholic historian respectively.(4) A character like his would naturally tend to be intolerant and impatient with others, and such ~~Urban~~ <sup>Urban</sup> VIII was. Even his death was caused by his distress when he was forced to sign a humiliating peace with the Duke of Parma over the unfortunate episode of Castro, and he died invoking heaven's vengeance on his enemies, who had humiliated him on the battlefield.(5)

He was not particularly distinguished for his piety. An acquaintance of his, while still a cardinal, put on paper his cynicism when he wrote to Galileo - who was condemned in Urban's pontificate - "Cardinal Barberini was telling me last night that the affairs of the heavens do not count here for much." (6) When he was a nuncio in Paris he had shown a great interest in the Roman Catholics in England; so the Pope appointed him Protector of Scotland. He had also shown an interest in the Greeks - he was a Greek scholar - so Gregory VI named him Protector of the Greek College and made him a member of the "Propaganda". (7) On his elevation to the See, he was ex officio responsible for the progress of the work of this body and the case of Cyril passed therefore into his able, cruel and impatient hands. In this affair he repeatedly evinced a keen interest and gave his own personal guidance in the efforts of the "Congregatio" to get rid of such an undesirable occupant of the See of Constantinople. That he would feel no scruple in bringing about the death of Cyril, as he eventually did, is shown by the feelings he expressed when the news of the death of another undesirable contemporary reached Rome, the King of Sweden Gustavus Adolphus. "The Pope has learnt with joy, writes his nephew Cardinal Francis Barberini, the disappearance of the serpent ..... His satisfaction is beyond words". (8)

Well might Urban VIII become impatient with the news that came from Constantinople. Not only had the triple plot against Cyril, which had so carefully been prepared, come to nothing, as we saw in the previous chapter, but that "son of darkness" was pushing his audacity to the point of placing as the head of his school in Constantinople such a well-known Calvinist as Corydalleus. This angered both Urban and the "Congregatio" (9) and they immediately took new measures against Cyril.

A meeting of the "Propaganda" was accordingly held on 13th November 1627 at the Palace of its Prefect, Cardinal Bandini. Bandini was

one of the most able members of the Sacred College, a man famous for his political experience and ability, and while Gregory XV was still alive he was considered by many as the future Pope. (10) In the able hands of this man lay the direction of the affairs of the "Propaganda" and of the war which Rome waged against Cyril. Besides the Prefect of the "Propaganda" there were present <sup>at that meeting</sup> the Cardinals Millini, Ludovisi, Megalotti and Barberini (the Pope's nephew). (11)

During the meeting letters were read from the French Ambassador in Constantinople, as well as from the Greek Archbishop of Naxos <sup>J</sup>eremias Barbarigo, to the effect that Cyril was not losing time in spreading the Calvinist doctrines among the Greeks. In this effort he was being supported by the English and Dutch ambassadors, and even favoured by the Representative of Venice. This favour shown to Lucaris by Venice was explained by De Cesy by the fact that the Venetian interests in the Ottoman Empire were clashing with those of Rome. (12)

It was clear, therefore, that new measures must be taken against Cyril, if the Greek Church was not going to be won by the Reformation. As a consequence the following decisions were taken:

(1) The Greek Jesuit Father Stavrinus should be asked to send to the "Propaganda" a book which a fellow-countryman of his and himself a member of the Society of Jesus, Andrew Eudaemon, had written in refutation of the Catechism of Zacharias Gerganos. The "Propaganda" had already in April 1624 ordered the printing of this book. (13) And Dr. Peter Arcudios and the Greek Archbishop Cariophyllus, who was friendly towards Rome, were to examine the book, before it was put in circulation. It seems, however, that Caryophyllus, at any rate, was not altogether satisfied with the book, for he prepared a refutation of his own of the Catechism of Gerganos, which was published four years later by the "Propaganda" itself. (14)

(2) That the famous letter of the Greek Cardinal Bessarion, an earlier proselyte of Rome, in which he was explaining the reasons for which

he had joined the Church of Rome, should be printed and widely circulated in Greece.

(3) That measures should be taken to reveal Cyril in public as a preacher of Calvinism.

(4) That the French Ambassador should use the name and authority of his King to bring about the deposition of Cyril. For this purpose money should also be used, although it would be better to reserve the money for a literary campaign against Cyril.

(5) The Apostolic Nuncio in Paris should use all his influence with the King of France to secure his personal interest in these plans. The French King should be made to see the great danger which would arise out of a possible alliance of the schismatic Greeks with England, Holland and the German Protestants.

It does not seem, however, that these exhortations were needed at the French court, because King Louis XIII had already exhibited a personal interest in the "affair Lucaris", as can be judged by the correspondence which was exchanged on this matter between De Cesy and his royal master. Already on April 15th 1623 he was writing to the King: "Since your majesty gave me instructions to bring about, if possible, the deposition of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, my time was not wasted, and if things go on like this, I have hopes to overwhelm him, although he is enjoying powerful support." Exactly one month later Louis XIII was writing from the Palace of Fontainebleau to his ambassador in Constantinople: "I have already written to ask you that you endeavour to have the Patriarch of Constantinople deposed from his office, because he is a Huguenot and soiled with heresy. And as it is important for the Catholic religion that this office should be filled by a person of moral life, professing the true religion, I shall be very pleased if you endeavour to have the Patriarch deposed from his charge and have somebody else take his



place, and advise me at your earliest convenience as to the results of your endeavours." This letter was, however, crossed with a letter of De Cesy to the King. "Since I wrote my last letter to Your Majesty, I made good use of my duties. I so acted in the matter of the deposition of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, that he is now away from his throne, by order of the Grand Vizir, and his successor, a good old man, an ex-archbishop of Amassia of Pontus, came to thank me."(15)

(6) The Greek merchants should take a definite attitude towards Lucaris, if they do not want "to forfeit the protection of the Christians". This is the wording used by the Roman Catholic historian Von Pastor(16) The actual decision of the "Propaganda", however, as preserved in the minutes of that meeting(17) is much stronger. The decision was threatening the Greek merchants that unless they took a definite attitude against Cyril, they "would suffer damage from the Christian soldiers". These "Christian soldiers" were of course no other than the pirates, who at that time, under various flags and in vast numbers, were carrying on plundering and slave-hunting expeditions all over the Mediterranean Sea.(18) The Greek merchants had fresh in their minds the memory of previous expeditions against them by the Maltese pirates whom the Holy See had ordered "not to spare the heretical Greeks", at a time when the rival claims of the Roman and the Greek Orthodox Church on the guardianship of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem were being examined by the Forte.(19) The "Propaganda" was now threatening the Greeks with a new eruption against them of the activities of these noble "Christian soldiers", unless they declared themselves openly as enemies of Cyril.

Such were the decisions which were taken at that meeting of the "Propaganda". In the meantime, however, another measure was put in practice,

which was decided upon at an earlier time. This measure came at a time when Cyril and the Greeks of Constantinople began to hope that they were going to enjoy a time of peace.(20) In the month of December 1626 an "Anti-patriarch" was sent by Rome to the Levant, "not in order to supplant the Patriarch, but in order to supervise the interests of the Roman Catholic Church in the Near East, as L. Allatius puts it, so that the poison of the heretics should not affect its own members, as it had done to not a few of the Greeks."(21) The Anti-Patriarch was given the authority of the Pope to "build and destroy, to plant and uproot, and do anything that would promote the plans of Rome."(22) He was also accompanied by a Treasurer, who had in his keeping the money which the "Propaganda" had decided to spend in the "affair<sup>2</sup> Lucaris". The presence of this Treasurer renewed the bitterness of the French Ambassador, which the arrival of Cannachio Rossi had roused, as he was anxious to keep in his own hands both the initiative of the struggle against Cyril, and even more - for he was notorious for his debts,(23) the money which was being used in it. It seems, however, that the "Congregatio" had its own reasons for not wanting to leave the money in the hands of DeCesy, as the English Ambassador was writing at this time: "Saint Peter does not trust the French Ambassador with His money." The presence, however, of a Treasurer side by side with the "Apostolic Suffragan", was meant to add to the eminence of the office of the latter the glitter of gold which had at that time a special charm both for the Greeks and the Turks of the Levant. Moreover the Anti-Patriarch had the authority to establish Roman Catholic bishops in Smyrna and in certain islands of the Aegean, who, by their manifest superiority to the Greek Orthodox bishops from the point of view of education, were certain to create a favourable impression on the Greeks and thus increase the confusion prevailing at that time in large sections of the Greek Church.

By the end of 1626 this "Suffragan" arrived in the island of Naxos, and to that island the French Ambassador immediately despatched a bishop and two

Jesuits to add to the splendour of the welcome which was extended to this Envoy of the Pope. This delegation from Constantinople conducted the "Suffragan" to the island of Chios, where a magnificent welcome was extended to him. And it was planned to conduct the "Suffragan" from Ghios to Constantinople itself. The arrogance and vanity of this man, however, defeated his own plans. For so high-handed was he in his dealings not with the Greeks only, but also with the Roman Catholics in the places which he visited, who did not belong to the party of the Jesuits, that a general outcry rose against him. On the part of the Greeks, because they saw in the arrival and the proceedings of this new emissary of the Pope a new danger for their religious freedom. On the part of the Roman Catholics, who were not in sympathy with the Jesuits, because they were afraid lest this arrogance should provoke against them all, indiscriminately, the displeasure of the Turkish authorities.

How did this bubble burst? It is not easy to say. It appears that some intervention of the powerful friends of Cyril with the Turkish authorities took place. Beyond this, however, we do not know much about the form which the reaction against the "Suffragan" took. All of a sudden, however, the scenery underwent a radical change. The pompous procession of the "Suffragan" and his retinue was cut short; the titular bishops sent from Rome, together with some of their Jesuit friends, were cast into prison; their official papers were seized; and the "Apostolic Suffragan" was only saved from the humiliation of a Turkish prison by the haste with which he exchanged the field of his short-lived triumphs for the safety of Rome. This unexpected calamity, which befell the Jesuits of Constantinople, has, however, some connection with another episode in Cyril's adventurous career, which <sup>we</sup> are now going to narrate.

Footnotes to Chapter 7.

. . . .

- (1) Von Pastor, "History of the Popes", XXVIII 1, XXVIII 34, 35; Lacy Collison-Morley, "Italy after the Renaissance", 183.
- (2) Lacy Collison-Morley, op.cit. 139.
- (3) Ogg, "Europe in the 17th Century", 400; Lacy Collison-Morley, op.cit. 138.
- (4) Leopold Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries", Vol. II, 268; Von Pastor, "History of the Popes", Vol. XXVIII, 48.
- (5) Ranke, op.cit. II, 320; Ogg, op.cit. 402.
- (6) Philarete Chasles, "Galileo Galilei", 6.
- (7) Von Pastor, op.cit., XXVIII, 30, 32.
- (8) A. Leman, "Urbain VIII et la rivalité de la France et de la Maison d'Autriche de 1631 a 1635", 245.
- (9) G. Hoffmann, S.I., in "Orientalia Christiana", No. 52, 36-37.
- (10) Von Pastor, op.cit. XXVIII, 5.
- (11) Scrittura Riferite, Vol. 270r-209v.
- (12) Von Pastor, op.cit. XXIX, 228-233.
- (13) Acta, 1624: 101r-101v, as quoted by Hoffmann, op.cit. 36-37; Legrand I, 159 ff.
- (14) Legrand IV, 285.
- (15) Evd. Hurmuzaki, "Documente Privitove la Istoria Romanilor", Supplem. I, 206, 208.
- (16) Op.cit. XXIX, 233.
- (17) Published by the Jesuit Father G. Hoffmann, as above.
- (18) See Hammer, "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman", IX, 29, 30; William Miller, "Essays on the Latin Orient", 193; Ricaut, "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman", 30; G. Finlay, "History of Greece", Vol. V, 90-91, 100; "The Diary of Thomas Dallam, 1599-1600", 17-18, 96-97.



(19) Vertot, "Histoire de chevaliers de St. Jean de Jerusalem", IV, 145;

Finlay, op.cit. Vol. III

(20) Th. Smith, op.cit. 33.

(21) Op.cit. Lib. III, 1072; See also Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 215;

Th. Smith, op.cit. 33-35; "Narratio Turbarum", in Smith's Collectanea 98-99;

Th. Roe, "Relation of the Practices of the Jesuits Against Cyrillus Patriarch of Constantinople", 758.

(22) Chrysoscule Logothetis, in loco.

(23) Marquis de Bounac, "Memoire Historique sur l'Ambassade de France", 10-14.

. . . . .

## Chapter 8

A Printing House is set up in Constantinople.

. . . . .

In June 1627 an English ship sailed into the harbour of Constantinople and it brought to Cyril and to ~~his~~ his work reinforcements of a most desirable nature. Among its passengers there was a Greek monk by the name of Nicodemus Metaxas. Metaxas was a well-educated man. He had received his education chiefly from his uncle, the senior Nicodemus Metaxas, bishop of the island of Cephallonia, with whom he shared a great love for their enslaved country and a desire to bring the lights of education to their fellow-countrymen. Later the junior Nicodemus was to succeed the senior in the See of Cephallonia.

When his education was completed, Nicodemus Metaxas came to London, in 1620, and settled <sup>down</sup> with his brother who was a merchant there. He realized that books were the great ~~and~~ most urgent need of his people, and this need he resolved in some measure to satisfy. So, his brother helping him on the financial side, he set up in London a small Greek printing house, which produced a few useful Greek books. With the passing of time, however, Metaxas perceived that London was at too great a distance from Greece to be a suitable place for a Greek printing house. In due time, therefore, he made up his mind to transfer his field of operations from London to Constantinople. That is how we find him in June 1627 landing in Constantinople.

On the same ship, in which Nicodemus Metaxas came, there was, stored in big cases, a great problem, which was puzzling the mind of Metaxas ever since the ship cast anchor. For in the cases there was the whole

of the equipment of the former printing house of London, as well as a fine collection of books. And the problem was how to have all those big cases pass through the Custom-House, without arousing the suspicions of the Turkish authorities, whose ignorance in matters of this kind would only tend to make them more suspicious.

As soon, therefore, as Metaxas set foot on solid ground, he went to the Patriarchate to ask for the assistance of the Patriarch, about whom he had heard, while in London, from his friend Metrophanes Critopulos. It is not difficult to imagine the joy of Lucaris when the news came thus to him that close by, in the very harbour of the city, there lay the possibility of the first printing house being established among the enslaved Greek people, which would help him to disseminate far and wide among his fellow-countrymen the great truths which he loved and for which he was fighting.(1)

Great as his joy was, however, he realized that the printing-house was not yet within his reach and that to pilot those cases through the suspicious authorities of the Custom House was too big a thing to be undertaken by himself. He asked, therefore, the Archbishop of Corinth to accompany Metaxas to the English Embassy and to request on his behalf the English Ambassador to help them in this important matter.

The English Ambassador himself was hesitant at first to be involved in an undertaking which was fraught with danger. He did not want, however, to refuse his services to his friend the Patriarch, in connection with such a fine project. A time of consultations followed with Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria Gerassimus Spartaliotes, and the Dutch Ambassador, the outcome of which was that the English Ambassador secured an interview with the Grand Vizir, from whom, without much difficulty, he obtained the permission to have the precious cargo unloaded.

Cyril was not without his fears as to the possible reaction of the Jesuits and their powerful friends against a printing house working under his control. He therefore expressed the desire that the printing press should be set up in the Embassy itself. But Sir Thomas Roe, felt that he would be going too far in the protection which he rendered Lucaris, if he were to turn part of the Embassy into a Greek printing house, and he refused this request. He hired, however, a house in which the printing press was established. The house was quite near the English Embassy, but it was even nearer the French one(2) and from that quarter Metaxas and his friends should now expect some trouble.

That the Jesuits would get angry with that new move of their adversary was to be expected. What would certainly make them even angrier, however, was the fact that at that particular time the "Congregatio de Propaganda Fide" itself had set up a Greek printing house in Rome. In 1622 it was decided that a printing press, provided with Greek, Latin, Arabic, Armenian and Illyrian type, should be placed at the disposal of the "Propaganda". Part of the equipment was given by the Vatican Library and the press was finally set up on July 14th, 1626,(3) i.e. only eleven months before the arrival of Metaxas in Constantinople. The authorities of the "Propaganda" and their Jesuit agents in Constantinople had, no doubt, great hopes that their press would help them to inundate the Near East with their literature. And it was with feelings of dismay that they saw at this particular time a rival printing press being established in Constantinople, which, so far as their work among the Greeks was concerned, would counteract in some measure their activities. They decided therefore that they should try by all possible means to snatch this powerful weapon out of Cyril's hands.

At first the Jesuits made use of flattery and ruse. They conceived the hope of attracting Metaxas into their own party and they sent him



polite invitations to visit them in their Convent, indicating to him that if he joined them, he would clear himself of the stain that was attached to his character by the fact that he had made his studies in England. Metaxas was apparently not very eager to have his good name cleared from the stain, and he turned a deaf ear to the polite invitations of the Jesuits. Realizing, however, that it would not be very long before his adversaries employed more drastic methods he busied himself in making the best of his opportunity.

As soon as he had the printing press established, he started work, and it is amazing to see how many books he was able to publish in the short time that his printing press was permitted to operate. And all the books published were of such a nature as to make it clear to the Jesuits that Cyril and <sup>M</sup>etaxas meant business. One of the first books to be printed was one written by Meletios Pegas, in which the celebrated late uncle of Cyril, in a series of letters, was examining and repudiating the claim of the Pope to be the head of the whole Church. Once again the nephew honoured the work of his great uncle. Another book, on the same subject, followed, written by Nilus, Archbishop of Thessalonica. A further book, still on the same subject, appeared shortly afterwards, which was written by Gabriel, Archbishop of Philadelphia. Other books followed on controversial subjects, such as on Purgatory, by Barlaam, etc.(4) Strange to say, the most innocent of all the books produced by the Greek printing house of Constantinople was the one contributed by Cyril himself, which was a short treatise on the Jews. Not that this indicated any change of mind on the part of Cyril. Quite on the contrary, at this very time he was at work preparing his big guns, in the form of a Catechism, in which he was stating the position of the Greek Church and his own on the various articles of the Christian faith, as against the position taken by the Church of Rome. This Catechism, or Confession of Faith was intended to be Cyril's great contribution in the issue which was dividing the

East from the West, and it was intended to be printed at the printing house of Metaxas. But the Jesuits forestalled him.

When these saw that words of flattery had no effect on Metaxas, they immediately changed policy and they attempted to intimidate him by threats. They intimated to him that they would have him assassinated some night when he was returning to his lodgings, or even in his own room while he slept. Metaxas saw that the situation was becoming rather serious; so to his protector, the English Ambassador, he addressed himself once again, and Sir Thomas Roe added to the kindnesses shown to Cyril and to his work by offering to Metaxas a room in the Embassy in which he could sleep and be safe.

The only way now open for the Jesuits, in order to have the work of the printing press stopped, was the way to the Turks, and this they took. And the way was this time opened for them by that innocent book which Cyril wrote on the Jews. This the Jesuits examined carefully and to their great pleasure they discovered in it one or two passages, in which Cyril was criticising in a mild way certain opinions of the Moslems as well. With this book in their hands, and having made use of the mediating services of a certain ex-Voyvode of Galata, who was in friendly terms with the Grand Vizir, they were able to place the accusation against Cyril that he was insulting through his books the Coran and that Metaxas, being himself a man well acquainted with the art of war, had come to Constantinople with the special purpose of stirring up among the people a sedition against the Turkish authorities, and also of using his strange machinery in order to falsify the official documents of the Sultan and thus to create a confusion within the Empire.

The Grand Vizir was deeply impressed by these accusations and he decided to take at one measures against Metaxas and his printing

operations. He commanded therefore an officer of the army to take a company of the <sup>5</sup>Yannissaries - an army corps that was composed of renegade Greeks, the sad fruit of the system of "child-gathering", which we had the opportunity of mentioning in a previous chapter, and was particularly famous for the ferocity of its members - and proceed to the printing-house, in order to seize Metaxas and collect proofs of his crime.

It was the 4th of January 1628, i.e. hardly six months had elapsed since Metaxas landed in Constantinople, which makes us admire all the more the activity which he developed in this short time. The company of the Yannissaries were ready to perform the orders which they had received. The French Ambassador, however, who had apparently a taste for the dramatic element, managed to have the execution of the above order postponed for two days, because he had the information that the English Ambassador had invited to dinner for the 6th of January, day of the Epiphany, a number of people, among whom the Patriarch and the Representative of Venice, and he preferred the two events to coincide, so that, as he put it himself, he should "add some sauce to the dishes" of the ambassadorial dinner.(5)

On the 6th January, therefore, about noon, when Sir Thomas Roe's guests were enjoying the bounty of his table, the company of the Yannissaries invaded the house of Metaxas, after they had blockaded all the streets that led to it, so that the culprit may not escape them. The whole quarter of the town was panic-stricken at the sight of the dreaded Yannissaries and of the special measures of precaution which were being taken; no one, however, knew the reason for these.

It so happened that at the time of the visit of the officer and his soldiers Metaxas was not in the printing-house. He was just coming back from the Church of Galata, in the company of the Secretary of

the English Ambassador. Some people from the crowd recognized him and indicated him to the officer as being the man whom he was searching for. The officer, however, did not believe them, or at any rate did not dare to seize Metaxas, as the latter was attired in an English-made suit and hat and not in the dress which was usual among the Greeks of Constantinople. And when the Secretary of the Ambassador assured the officer that the person with the English suit and hat was in the service of his master, all doubt was dispelled and Metaxas was let free to go. In this strange way an English-made suit probably saved the life of a man useful to the Greek nation at that critical time.

It saved Metaxas, but not his property. The captain, enraged to find that he could not lay his hands on the man for whom he had come, let his soldiers loose to plunder and destroy to their heart's content. And it is known from contemporary history that a Yannisary's heart was not likely to be content except only with total destruction.

They broke drawers and cup-boards open and they searched everywhere for proofs of Metaxas' guilt. And those items of furniture and machinery and the books which they could not take with them, they destroyed.

The grievous news at last arrived<sup>at</sup> the English Embassy. The Ambassador felt that this was an insult against him personally and against his royal master, seeing that it was he who had secured the permission of the authorities to have the printing press set up and the house, in which it was established, had been hired in his own name. It was clear to him that he should take very drastic measures in order to reestablish his prestige which had so badly suffered.

In the meantime Cyril's book on the Jews was being examined in the presence of the Grand Vizir by a number of Mollahs, or



provincial Judges, and the more it was examined, the less clear it became that it contained the blasphemies against the Goran, which the Jesuits had attributed to it. The case was at last submitted to the higher authority of the Mufti, who pronounced his judgement on it by saying that "all doctrine contrary to the precepts of Mohamet is not necessarily a blasphemy or a crime; that since the christians had secured the Imperial permission to profess their doctrines, it was not more criminal for them to do this by printing their beliefs than it was by preaching them; and in accordance with the law not the diversity of opinion was punishable, but the scandal which might accompany its propagation". A judgment, so liberal, sober and broadminded as this, coming from the lips of a Moslem, was a resounding slap in the face of those Christian missionaries who went so far as to make themselves defenders of the prestige of the Coran, in order to find there weapons to fight ~~against~~ a fellow-Christian.

At any rate this judgment of the Mufti shook considerably the Grand Vizir's conviction about the guilt of Metaxas and made him begin to think that after all the despatch of that company of the Janissaries and the summary way in which they dealt with the situation may not have been the best course which he could have adopted.

At this point the English Ambassador made his appearance. For two days he had kept himself in his Embassy and on the the third day after the events he sought and secured an audience with the Grand Vizir. In a very frank and rather outspoken way he reminded the Grand Vizir that it was by his own permission that that printing house had been set up, and that nothing had been done in this connection without his approval or his knowledge, and therefore he, the English Ambassador, was greatly surprised to see that the Grand Vizir had suddenly developed so grave suspicions against his friends, and gave the permission for such outrages to be committed against them.

p. 103 follows →

fruitless. He sought an audience with the Grand Vizir, but he was not granted it, and at last the Caimacam, the Grand Vizir's deputy, declared to him: "If you want to stay here and behave as an ambassador should behave, you will always be welcome and the honour due to the dignity of your office will always be given you. But if you think that you have the right to protect the enemies of the Porte, and that the friendship of your King to the Porte does not mean anything more than this, you can leave this country, whenever you want, and we shall take good care to inform your king about the real state of things, so that full justice should be done both to him and to the Porte".(6) This was very plain speaking and the French Ambassador could not fail to understand it.

At last, after many deliberations, the order was issued that the Jesuits should be driven out of all territories of the Ottoman Empire. This was immediately made known to the authorities of Chios, Smyrna, Aleppo and Cyprus, so that they could give effect to the decision of the Porte against any Jesuits residing there, and the three Jesuits who had been seized in Constantinople were embarked on a ship and, after a few more frustrated attempts on their part to escape, early in 1628 they were safely deposited on Italian soil.

The satisfaction that this gave to the Greek Church in Constantinople and their friends was best expressed by Sir Thomas Roe(8): "They are burst hardly to be pulled off. I hope they shall little trouble the poore Greek Church hereafter who hath spent and is indebted by their practices 12.000 dollars, besides this last insurrection against the stamp, the life of the Patriarch, and my honor."

That "they shall little trouble the poore Greek Church hereafter" was probably too bold a wish to be expressed by one who knew the tenacity and cunning with which the Society of Jesus promoted its plans. No

The Grand Vizir, who had a great regard for the English Ambassador, protested that he had not in the least the intention to insult him, and that he was surprised with the impudence of those who had deceived him with their false accusations against Metaxas. The Ambassador was not, however, to be appeased, but seeing that he had already won the first round with the Grand Vizir, he redoubled his protests and declared that he would not be satisfied unless the criminals who had engineered this plot against Metaxas were punished in an exemplary way and that a full reparation was made to Metaxas for the damage which he had suffered.

In the meantime the Patriarch, who was keeping himself at home for the fear of more outrages, was receiving a visitor. The visitor was Cannachio Rossi, the special Emissary of the Pope, who was still lingering in Constantinople. Rossi was not aware of the latest development of the situation; he only knew of the Roman triumph against Metaxas, and he came to make the bitter cup which the Patriarch had just drunk even more bitter by his own personal insults. Rossi's cheap triumph, however, did not last long. The protests of the Ambassador prevailed with the Grand Vizir and the order was issued that Cannachio Rossi and the Jesuits who had falsely accused Metaxas should be cast in prison.

The situation had now undergone a complete change. The triumphant Jesuits and Rossi, panic-stricken, shut themselves in their Monastery, not daring to show themselves in public. Three of the Jesuits, however, were seized and were cast in prison, and soon afterwards Cannachio Rossi was sent to keep them company. In the meantime the French Ambassador, who realized now with bitterness that he would have to taste himself the "sauce" which he had destined for the dish of his English colleague, made use of all possible means with the Turkish authorities, from flattery to threatening, in order to have his proteges released. But all his efforts remained

← back to 104

sooner had the banished Jesuits arrived in Italy than they endeavoured to have the order of their banishment recalled and return to Constantinople. The French Ambassador not being, for the time being, in the Turks' good graces, the Austrian Ambassador Baron de Kuefstein's services were sought for and he <sup>did</sup> made everything possible to have the order of banishment revoked. In pursuing this object, he even made use of means hardly compatible with the dignity of the ambassador of a Great Power, such as the subtle interpretation which he proposed to the article 7 of the Treaty of Vienna. This article provided religious freedom for all christians (in turkish "Issevi", i.e. "followers of Jesus") in Turkey. This "Issevi" was seized upon by baron de Kuefstein, who suggested nothing less than that the "followers of Jesus", whom religious liberty was provided for by the Treaty of Vienna were the members of the "Society of Jesus". This argument was, however, altogether too clever to be effective, and de Kuefstein had to give up his efforts.(9) And it was once again De Césy who eventually opened for his protégés the way to Constantinople. It has been said that "when you chase a Jesuit through the door, he comes back through the window", (10)" and it was through the window that they came back. When the storm was abated and the first impressions forgotten, the French Ambassador secured the permission to have two Jesuits introduced into Constantinople, who were to serve as chaplains to the Ambassador.(11) It needs hardly be said that the two Jesuits did not confine themselves to what one would normally describe as the duties of the chaplain to an ambassador. In the course of time more "chaplains" were secured for the embassy, and thus was the Society of Jesus reestablished in Constantinople after the disgrace they had suffered following the episode of Metaxas. Nevertheless the hope which Sir Thomas Roe expressed that "they shall little trouble the poore Greek Church hereafter" came true, for from this point the Jesuits disappear almost completely from our narrative of Lucaris' life and work. Not that Rome withdrew its finger



from the Greek pie, or that Lucaris was left undisturbed to proceed with his work of reformation in the Greek Church. Quite on the contrary, after the humiliation which Rome suffered in connection with the episode of Metaxas, the "Propaganda" took up with a redoubled zeal its efforts to get rid of the Calvinist Patriarch. But it ceased making use of the services of the Jesuits. Another monastic order proffered itself as an instrument for the promotion of the plans of the "Propaganda". At this stage the centre of gravitation<sup>v</sup> in the effort of the Church of Rome to check the Reformation movement in the Greek East, passes from the Jesuits to the Capuchins, and from the Ambassador of France De Cesy to the Ambassador of the Emperor, Rodolf Schmidt-Schwarzenhorn. Of this, however, we shall have to speak in fuller detail in a following chapter.

Before we take leave of Metaxas, one would like to know what became of his printing press. Dositheus, in his "History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem"(12) states that during the troubles that broke out "the press was cast into the sea". Legrand, however, (13) states that this is not true and that when Metaxas became Archbishop of Cephallonia he was still in possession of his printing press. However that may be, either because Metaxas was disappointed or because his equipment suffered injuries at the hands of the Yannissaries which he could not repair, the printing-house of Constantinople never resumed its activities. That was the end of a beautiful dream.

One can only imagine the wrath of the "Propaganda" when the news came of the disaster which befell the Jesuits in Constantinople. No time was lost, therefore, to take new measures against the hated Patriarch. A meeting of the "Congregatio" was convened for the 21st of July 1628 in the Palace of Cardinal Bandini, in which after the letters received from De Cesy were read, it was decided that all Roman missionaries on the spot should try to secure the assistance of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem in their efforts against Lucaris. That the Greek bishops who were friendly

towards Rome should be asked to give their advice as to the best way to establish legal proceedings against Lucaris. That the Nuncio in Venice should enlighten the Venetian Senate as to the theological position of Lucaris and succeed to put an end to the support which the Venetian Representative was giving him. That eighteen thousand dollars should be sent to Constantinople, twelve thousand to be contributed by the Holy See and the remaining 6.000 by the Most Christian King of France, to be used in the fight against Cyril, with the understanding that the money should be given to the Greek bishops only after they had secured Cyril's deposition. That Père Joseph of Paris, Head of the Capuchins, should be asked to proceed to Constantinople, under the pretext of visiting the missionaries of his order there, in reality, however, in order to promote the deposition of Lucaris.(14)

Père Joseph, of whom the above decision of the "Propaganda", was Joseph Leclerc de Tramblays, the famous "Eminence Grise", Richelieu's close friend and his right hand in the direction of the intricate foreign policy of France at that time. Richelieu did not grant his friend the permission to accept the invitation of the "Propaganda", as he could not spare him from the Foreign Office in Paris at that time,(15) but Père Joseph took ever since a personal interest in the matter of Lucaris, and most of the measures which were taken against the Patriarch since that time to the end were first submitted to his approval.

Of all strange personalities of the seventeenth century Father Joseph was possibly the strangest; a mixture of religiosity, mysticism and political cunning, about whom a colleague of his in the French Foreign Office had said that "the Father had in fact no soul, but in its stead were holes and quicksands, into which every one must fall who should attempt to have any dealings with him".(16) Father Joseph had also some personal interest in Greece. One of his dreams was to organise a crusade against the Turk and

have Constantinople liberated and the Byzantine Empire revived, under French tutelage of course. For this purpose he gave his support to the Duke of Nevers, whose paternal grandmother was a descendant of the Imperial family of the Palaeologi. In order to promote the case of the Crusade he undertook travels to Rome and Spain and on his way to Spain he composed a long lyrical rhapsody on the liberation of the Greeks from Turkish bondage. He addresses himself to Hellas in his poem and says: "If in order to succour thee, I overturn the world, it is all too little for my wishes: to quench the fires of my ardour, I must drown me in a sea<sup>of</sup> blood".(17) To such a man it is no wonder that the case of Lucaris presented a special interest and that "the fires of his ardour" were not quenched until the news came that the Patriarch, who soiled the seat of Palaeologi with his Calvinism, was dead.

A further meeting of the "Congregatio" took place four days later, on July 25th 1628, this time presided over by the Pope himself. Three possible methods of dealing with Lucaris were discussed. The first was to establish proceedings against him before the Roman Inquisition, the second was to establish proceedings before a Synod of Greek Patriarchs and bishops, the third was the usual way of bribery both in connection with the Greek clerics who had the right of electing a Patriarch in their hands and in connection with the Turkish authorities. Of these three methods, after much deliberation, the third was adopted, as more effective. The "Congregatio", however, was not willing to proceed in applying this method - as if this were the first time that the Roman authorities had recourse to bribery in their efforts to get rid of Cyril -(18) without first ascertaining that according both to human and Divine law it was a right and just method. A questionnaire was, therefore, submitted to the Inquisition on the following points: Whether according to Divine and human law it was permissible to use bribery in order to bring about Cyril's deposition; whether it was worthy of the dignity of

the Holy See to have recourse to such a method; whether it was more worthy of the dignity of the Holy See to spend this money in bribing the Turks or in bribing the Greek bishops who have a part in the election of the Patriarch; whether by any other means this deposition could be rendered just and honest.(19)

It took the Holy Office a long time to complete its investigations, preliminary to giving an answer to the above questionnaire, but at last on March 23rd 1629 the Pope informed the "Congregatio" that the Holy Office approved of the deposition of Cyril and it declared that it was quite in accordance with Divine and human law to use bribery in order to bring about this desirable end.

These decisions of the "Congregatio" combined with the fact that from now on responsible for the execution of its decisions would be the Capuchins, with Father Joseph behind the scenes, and the Imperial Ambassador in Constantinople Rudolph Schmidt, open a new period in the struggle of the Church of Rome against Cyril and his reformation work. These decisions, however, took effect after the year 1628 expired, and we cannot take leave yet of this year, because in the year 1628 there took place another event, probably the most important in the whole of Cyril's adventurous career.

. . . . .



Footnotes to Chapter 8.

. . .

- (1) For the setting up of the printing house and its sequel see: Th. Smith, op.cit., 35-42; Leger, op.cit. in Smith's "Collectanea" 32-83; Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 217-34; L. Allatius, op.cit. Lib. III, 1072.
- (2) Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 218.
- (3) Von Pastor, op.cit., XXIX, 216.
- (4) Legrand, op.cit. IV, 234-243.
- (5) Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 221.
- (6) Zinkeizen, "Histoire de L'Empire Ottoman", Vol. IV, 374.
- (7) Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit. 229-34; Archives of Venice, as quoted by Hammer, op.cit. IX, 112-113; Letter of De Cesy in "Scritture Riferite", Vol. 170r-180v; Von Pastor, op.cit. XXIX, 233.
- (8) Op.cit., 742.
- (9) Hammer, op.cit., Vol. IX, 114, 115.
- (10) Zottos, "Union Chretienne", Vol. IX, 95.
- (11) Chrysoscule Logothetis, op.cit., 234.
- (12) Liber XI, cap. IX, par. VIII, p. 1174.
- (13) Op. cit., IV, 243.
- (14) "Scritture Riferite", Vol. 270: 210r-212r.
- (15) G. Arvanitides, C. Lucaris,<sup>107</sup> ~~[and most of the measures which were taken against the Patriarch since that time to the end were first submitted to his approval.]~~
- (16) L. Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries", Vol. II, 280.
- (17) See A. Huxley, "The Grey Eminence", 104-113 passim.
- (18) See in p. 78, despatch of special emissary of "Propaganda" to Constantinople to announce that money would be forthcoming.
- (19) "Scritture Riferite", Vol. 270: 212r-213r.

Chapter 9.

"Confessio Fidei"

. . . .

In one of the valleys of Piedmont, among the Italian Alps, a young man, the Rev. Antoine Leger, was working as the Pastor of the Church of St. Martin's. One day, late in February 1628, a letter came to the elders of the Church of St. Martin's from the Local Synod of the Reformed Church, in which the Synod was passing on to them a request of the Company of the Pastors and Professors of the Church in Geneva that their Pastor should be released from his charge in order to be sent to Constantinople to take up his duties as the chaplain of the Dutch Embassy. The Dutch Ambassador in Constantinople had asked for a young theologian, well versed in Hebrew and Greek and able to preach in Italian, which was at that time the most widely spoken European language in the Levant, who would be willing to be appointed chaplain to the Embassy, for, the ambassador went on to say, "there are at the present time great openings for the Gospel".(1) The company of the Pastors and Professors, after much deliberation, decided to ask Mr. Leger to fill this place, as he was a man who "had the talents necessary for the requirements of such a calling".(2) Mr. Leger was not at all willing to accept this "call", because, as he put it in his answer, "he did not feel himself to be the suitable person for the duties of such a post" and he was further very anxious about his present church in case he left it.(3) Still less willing was the Church of St. Martin's to lose its Pastor and the "anciens" of the Valleys in their reply to the Company of Geneva, on 15th March, expressed their sorrow that it was quite impossible for them to agree to the proposed translation of the Rev. Leger, in view of the excellent

work which he was doing, not only in his own church, but also up and down the valleys. (4) A new meeting of the Company was held in Geneva and another letter was despatched to the "Pastors of the Valleys", on March 24th, signed by Prevost, Turretin, the famous Swiss divine, Diodati, the author of the translation of the Bible into Italian and Chabroy, in which they expressed their sympathy for the reluctance of the "anciens" of the Valleys to release Mr. Leger, but they insisted that it was absolutely necessary that he should be released in order to take up a far more important work; another letter, written in the same spirit, was addressed to the people of St. Martin's church; and still another one to Mr. Leger. (5) Further communications came from the Pastors of the valleys, and on the 2nd June 1628 a meeting of the Company was held in Geneva at which Mr. Leger himself was present and explained the reasons for which both himself and his church were unwilling to part with each other. The members of the Company were, however, adamant in their insistence that he should proceed immediately to Constantinople, and one of the members of the Company, Mr. Turretin, was charged to write accordingly to the Dutch Ambassador and to the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had expressed a personal interest in this matter. (6)

Shortly afterwards Antoine Leger bade farewell to the Valleys and to the people of his church and early in the autumn of the same year he arrived in Constantinople (7) to take up his duties as chaplain to the Dutch Ambassador and - what is of greater importance for our narrative - to become Cyril's closest friend, to share with him the experiences of the remaining ten years of his adventurous career, and to assist him in the execution of the two greatest works of his life.

And greatly did Cyril need the new friend, because a few months ago his trusted friend Sir Thomas Roe had left Constantinople (8) and Cyril had lost his powerful protector. The new English Ambassador Sir Peter Wych did not refuse his assistance to Lucaris, but he did not develop the

same ties of friendship, which had linked Lucaris with Sir Thomas Roe. In the remaining ten years, therefore, the centre of gravitation, in the matter of the diplomatic assistance given to Lucaris, moves from the English to the Dutch Embassy in Constantinople. It was probably on the occasion of Sir Thomas Roe's departure and in order to show his feelings of gratitude for the kindness shown to him and the protection given him by the Ambassador of England that Cyril sent at that time to King Charles I of England as a gift the famous manuscript "Codex Alexandrinus", which is to day one of the treasures of the British Museum.

The first impressions of Leger ~~prof~~ of the spiritual condition of the people in Constantinople were not at all favourable. He was writing to the Company of the Pastors and Professors of the Church in Geneva a few months after his arrival in Constantinople: (9) "The ignorance of the people and of the majority of the clergy is something that is beyond belief .... And what is worse, one can detect among the people very little desire, or none at all, to be instructed in spiritual things." In the same letter he finds that two are the most important needs of the Greek people just now: "that the Holy Scriptures should be given to the people in a language which can be understood by them" and also "a small Catechism and other elementary helps necessary for the children". In both these works, necessary for the Reformation of the Greek Church, Leger was to give his invaluable assistance to the Patriarch. As early as in March 1629 he is able to announce to the Company of Geneva that in connection with the preparation of an edition of the New Testament in Modern Greek "the work has happily begun and one wishes that it should make good progress". This was a big undertaking and it required a long time before it was completed; therefore the first edition of the New Testament in Modern Greek did not make its appearance till nine years later, on the very year of Cyril's martyrdom - a fitting crown to the work of his life. The other project, however, the



preparation of a Catechism, by which the people should be taught the elements of Christian faith, was easier to attain<sup>t</sup>, and this made its appearance shortly after Leger arrived in Constantinople.

The preparation of such a Catechism was, as we have seen, one of Cyril's plans even before Leger's arrival, and that Catechism would have, no doubt, seen the light of day earlier than it did, had not the Jesuits interfered with the printing operations of Metaxas. It seems, however, that the arrival of that enthusiastic young preacher from the Pedemondese valleys had much to do with the revival of this old plan and a few months after Leger was settled in the Dutch Embassy he was able to despatch the Patriarch's manuscript to Geneva, where the first Latin edition of the famous "Confessio Fidei" was printed in March 1629. This first edition was dedicated to Cornelius Haga, the Dutch Ambassador, who had shown a deep and lasting interest in the work of the Patriarch. This first Latin edition was soon followed by an edition in Greek and Latin, in 1631, as well as by a French edition, without an indication of the place where it was printed. Shortly afterwards three more French translations appeared, two of them printed in Sedan and the third one in Amsterdam. Numerous translations in other European languages followed. An English edition was printed in London and another one was prepared by William Rait, under the title "A Vindication of the Reformed Religion, from the Reflections of a Romanist", which was printed in 1671 in Aberdeen by John Forbes. Rait had the intention to give in his edition both the Greek text of the "Confessio" and his English translation, so that the reader may be able to judge for himself about the accuracy of the translation and "adversaries can neither justly load us with noveltie of tenets, or paucitie of adherents: and he who will peruse both Confessions, may easily convince them of their errorour." Unfortunately, however, at the last minute the printer discovered that the amount of Greek type available in his shop would not permit him to set in

print the entire Greek text, so Rait confined himself in giving in Greek ~~only~~ the beginning<sup>only</sup> of each article.

The "Confessio" has eighteen articles followed by four questions and their answers. At the end of each article and each question there is a number of Scripture references, by which the truth of the "Confessio" is vindicated. The first and fourth articles deal with the doctrine of the Godhead - the triune God, and the doctrine of the Creation. The second article deals with the Scriptures, which is inspired by God and whose testimony is of greater value than that of the Church, "for man can err.... while the Holy Scriptures cannot err." In the third article Cyril deals with the doctrine of predestination and he takes a rather rigid position in teaching an absolute choice on the part of God, which he mitigates towards the end of the article by suggesting that this choice was made on a basis of justice. In the fifth article he attributes the government of the Universe to the Providence of God, which, however, is so much above our own limited judgment, that we can only accept it in humility.

In the sixth article the creation and the fall of man are dealt with, and the consequence of this "fall" is that "no man is born in the flesh who does not bear this burden". Following the doctrine of the fall of man, the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ from Virgin Mary and the Holy Ghost, His death, burial, resurrection and His promised Second Coming are dealt with in the following article. In article eight the Lord Jesus Christ is viewed as sitting on the right hand of the Father "as our mediator". "He alone acts as a true and genuine High Priest and Mediator." The following article is occupied with the application of Christ's saving work in the individual, and it declares that the only means of salvation is "faith in Jesus Christ which justifies."

The Universal Church is the subject of the following article and this Church is said to be the aggregate of the believers in Christ, "both those who have slept and have been restored in the Homeland, and those who are sojourners on the way". "Of this Church no mortal man can be the Head; our Lord Jesus Christ is its only Head." In article eleventh Cyril further deals with the Church, and he points out that in the particular congregations the chaff is to be found together with the wheat. The Teacher and Sanctifier of the Church, the following article declares, is the Holy Spirit, the only real Paraclete, whom Christ sends "from the Father" in order to teach the truth. Here Cyril maintains the same ground against the insertion of the "Filioque" in the Creed, which we saw him maintaining in earlier years in his correspondence with Uyttenbogaert.

In the following article the "Confessio" comes back to the subject of salvation and it declares that "man is justified by faith and not by works". The works, however, should not be neglected as they are the necessary evidences of the existence of faith. Article fourteenth deals with "free-will", which "in non-regenerate man is dead .... In those, however, who are born again by the Holy Spirit it is revived by grace. The following three articles deal with the Sacraments, which are two. Without the baptism, article sixteenth declares, nobody can have fellowship with Christ. In the Eucharist we have "the certain and real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ ... the one, however, that faith offers us and not the one which is invented and taught by transubstantiation. For we believe that the believers partake in the Supper of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ; not, however, by their teeth, but through their soul. For the body of the Lord is not the one which is visible to the eyes in the Sacrament and is partaken of, but the one which, in a spiritual way, faith partakes of and gives to us."

The final article deals with the state of dead, who are

either in heavenly joy or in condemnation. "Those who have been justified in this present life, are not liable to condemnation; those who have not been justified before they slept, are ordained unto eternal condemnation. This makes it clear that we cannot give heed to the fable of the Purgatory, but we declare that each one must repent now and seek the forgiveness of his sins through the Lord Jesus Christ, if he wants to be saved."

The first of the four questions which are appended to the "Confessio" deals with the right of every Christian to read the Scriptures and the answer given to this question is that the reading of the Scriptures is the inalienable right of every christian. The second question faces the problem whether the meaning of the Scriptures is clear to every Christian who reads them. Cyril in his answer accepts that there are many difficult passages in the Scriptures; the doctrines of the faith, however, are clear to those who have been born again and have been enlightened by the Holy Spirit. The third question deals with the canonical books of the Bible and the answer given is that the canonical books are those that have been recognized as such by the Council of Laodicea. And the final question deals with the question of Image-worship, and as an answer to this Cyril quotes the commandment: 'Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form that is in heaven above, or that is in earth beneath... Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them'. From which it is clear that whoever wants to have images of Christ and the saints may have them, but their worship we repudiate as being forbidden by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures".

It is not to be wondered at that a "Confessio Fidei" of such contents should rouse the antagonism of all those who did not favour the Reformation movement which had Cyril started within the Greek Church. Cyril's first encounter over his "Confessio" was with the new Ambassador of France Count de Marcheville, who succeeded De Cesy. The Patriarch,



according to a letter of the Dutch Ambassador Von Haga, preserved in Smith's "Collectanea"(10) went on the 22nd December 1631 to pay a visit of welcome to the new Ambassador of France, who received him with great politeness and addressed him as "Your Eminence", which was the title that had recently been accorded to the Cardinals. When the dinner, to which the Ambassador had asked the Patriarch to stay, was over, the Ambassador produced a copy of the "Confessio", showed it to the Patriarch and asked him if he recognized it as his own and if he insisted on adopting as his own the doctrines proclaimed therein. The Patriarch took the book in his hands and after a glance at it answered that it was his, but before one asked him if he insisted on adopting the doctrines contained therein, he should first convince him by means of the Word of God that these doctrines contained errors. "I am under no obligation whatever, he added, to give an account of my beliefs to the Pope. There are the Metropolitans and the Bishops of the Greek Church, and to these assembled in a Council, I am ready to justify my position, by reference to the Word of God and to the early Fathers of the Church." To this the ambassador replied that in Rome and France "His Eminence" was considered to be a Calvinist, and it would be much better for him if he were a Catholic, like the King himself, from whose favour and generosity he would have much to gain. Cyril put an end to this conversation by saying that: "In the matters of my beliefs and my eternal salvation, I shall obey neither the King of France nor any other person in the world, but shall strictly follow the dictates of my conscience."

This was, however, only the beginning. Cyril himself at the end of his Confession had foretold that "this Confession of ours will be a sign which is spoken against." And such a sign it has been indeed ever *after*. In Cyril's own life-time at least two repudiations of the "Confessio" were circulated, one written by J.M. Cariophyllis the pro-Roman Archbishop of

Iconium in 1632, and one by a certain Armenian by the name of Tilenus.(11) Cariophyllis' book was very fittingly dedicated to the Pope Urban VIII.

Three months after Cyril's death, in September 1638, a Synod was held in Constantinople, presided over by his successor Cyril, formerly Bishop of Berroea, which proceeded to anathematize both Cyril and his "Confessio". In the document, which embodies the decisions of this Synod the whole "Confessio" is being submitted to the scrutiny of the Body, point by point, and thirteen times it reiterates: "Cyril Lucaris who has said in his Confessio this and that be accursed". And at the bottom of these thirteen curses there lie the signatures of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril; of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Metrophanes Critopoulos, the friend and protégé of Lucaris; of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes; of twenty-four archbishops and Bishops, and twenty-one dignitaries of the Church of Constantinople. No more solemn condemnation could have been brought against the life-work of Cyril by the Church which he loved so much.

Four years later, in May 1642, a second council was held in Constantinople, presided over by the then Patriarch of Constantinople Parthenius, with the same purpose of condemning Cyril's "Confessio". The verdict of this Synod, which was entered in the official Codes of the Church, was that the whole of the "Confessio", with the only exception of its seventh article, was stained by the "Calvinist heresy" and alienated from the faith of the Greek Church. About the same time there was circulated a private condemnation of the "Confessio" by a certain monk, Arsenius by name, who does not hesitate to call Cyril "a wicked and disorderly person, who placed his own private interests above everything else". And a little earlier another Council, convened by the Metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Moghila, was held in Jassy, the capital of Moldavia and by a formal declaration condemned the "Confessio".

Thirty years later, in 1672, another Council, convened by the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus, was held ~~at~~ Jerusalem, or more correctly at Bethlehem and is therefore known both as Council of Jerusalem and Council of Bethlehem. This Council too proceeded to anathematize the "Confessio", it found the judgment of the Council of Constantinople just and condemned Cyril who "was made a Patriarch .... through the assistance of the Dutch Ambassador". This Synod seems to have been divided between two aims, the one to show that Cyril could not have been the author of such a heretical confession, and for this purpose it brings forth the testimony of some of his letters against ten of the articles of the "Confessio", and the other is to condemn him in case he was a heretic.

This Synod marks thus the beginning of a persistent endeavour made by many scholars, chiefly of the Greek Orthodox Communion, to prove that the "Confessio" was not Cyril's own work. And in this too the "Confessio" has ever since been, as its author had foretold, "a sign which is spoken against". A. Diomedes Kyriakos, in his Church History, (12) declares that: "It is not known who the author of this Confession was. The most probable is that it was the Jesuits who published it, so that they might incriminate their enemy Cyril." M. Gedeon, on the other hand, in his "Lists of Patriarchs", (13) maintains that "a certain Confession which was published in 1628 must have certainly been published by the Protestants, if not by some Papist, and was circulated under the name of Lucaris." To a Protestant is attributed again the authorship of the "Confessio" by Chrysostom Papadopoulos, Professor in the University of Athens, and later Archbishop of Athens, who expressed the belief that the "Confessio" was the personal work of A. Leger. (14) The same line is followed by Prof. A. Diamantopoulos (15) who writes: "Leger committed an immoral act, an act of blackmail against the representatives of the Greek Church,

by which he intended to bind them in favour of Protestantism. He wrote himself a "Confessio Fidei" and sent it to Geneva to be published, as if it emanated from the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Jerusalem." An earlier writer, Sathas,(16) wrote: "The Confessio Fidei which has been attributed to Lucaris was written by the Protestants". E. Velanidiotes(17) denies that this "spurious Confessio" is a work of Lucaris, but he does not express any opinion about its author.

Other scholars of the Greek Orthodox Communion, however, such as M. Rhenieris,(18) A. Demetracopoulos,(19) D.S. Balanos(20), accept the genuineness of the "Confessio".

One can sympathize with the divines of the Greek Orthodox Church who find it so difficult to accept that one of the greatest men who ever sat on the Ecumenical Throne of Constantinople was a Calvinist. One's own feelings are not, however, the criterion according to which questions such as the above are settled. One has to consider dispassionately and objectively the facts, and the facts, which have any bearing on the question, all point to the Lucarian authorship of the "Confessio".

First of all we have to consider the silence which Cyril kept on the matter of the authorship of the "Confessio", a silence which is very strange and, indeed, inexplicable, supposing he was not the author of the "Confessio". For the publication of the "Confessio" had no doubt, been, "the great event" of the day and Cyril's Roman Catholic adversaries made a great use of it as a weapon, in their effort to get rid of him, by presenting him to the people of his communion as a man who had betrayed his trust by declaring himself openly a Calvinist. This must have weakened considerably Cyril's position in the circles of his own Church and Cyril could not help feeling the disadvantage which accrued to him, especially in those troubled times, from the publication of the Calvinist "Confessio" under his name. Now, on the supposition that he



was not himself the author of the "Confessio" the simplest thing for him to do would be to disclaim publicly the authorship of the book and thus remove the difficulty which had suddenly come to be added to his other problems. Such a thing, however, Cyril never did. Almost ten years elapsed between the appearance of the "Confessio" and Cyril's death and Cyril never wrote a line to give even the vaguest hint that he was not himself the author of the book. On the contrary, when he was challenged by the French ambassador whether it was himself who wrote it, he solemnly declared that <sup>it was.</sup> ~~he did.~~

We spoke of Cyril's silence in the matter of the authorship of the "Confessio" and this is one of the most common arguments for its genuineness. The silence was not, however, absolute. Three years after the publication of the "Confessio" Diodati of Geneva sent Lucaris a copy of his Italian translation of the Bible and in acknowledging the receipt of this gift, the Patriarch wrote on April 15 1631 a letter(21), in which he referred to his own "Confessio". Diodati had, apparently, asked him whether he had published anything of his own and Cyril answered: "At present I have published nothing but the Confession of Faith". Doubts about the genuineness of the "Confessio", it seems, had been roused even at that time, for he adds: "Here in Constantinople many copies of my Confession have been written, and many friends requested me to authenticate it with my own hand, which I did not refuse them; but now they no longer need copies published with my signature, for the reasons which I will presently make known to you" - and he proceeds to give an account of his meeting with the French ambassador and the public declaration which he had made that the "Con-

fessio" was his own work. This, he thought, ought to put an end to all doubts on this point.

In support of the genuineness of the "Confessio" we have, further, the numerous letters which Cyril sent to the Protestant divines Uytenbogaert, le Leu de Wilhem and Leger. The genuineness of the letters was never, so far as I know, questioned by those who reject the Lucarian authorship of the "Confessio". These letters are, however, full of the doctrines which were expounded in the "Confessio" in a fuller and more systematic way. The genuineness of the "Confessio" therefore cannot very well be rejected, unless those letters too are proved to be forgeries.

Finally, we have in support of the Cyrillian authorship of the "confessio" the testimony of the Synods of the Greek Church. As it has been stated already, in four different Synods, held after Cyril's death, the "Confessio" was officially condemned. Of these condemnations the most important for our purpose is the one by the Synod of Constantinople of 1638. Among the leaders of the Church who took part in that Synod and condemned the "Confessio" and anathematized its author, was the Patriarch of Alexandria Metrophanes Critopulos. We know what a debt of gratitude Critopulos owed to Cyril, with whom to the end of his life he was united by ties of respect and affection. And one can imagine the bitterness of the task with which Critopulos was confronted when he was called upon to sign the document, in which the memory of his friend and benefactor was cursed. It is certain that had there been a way of escape open for Critopulos, he would have taken it. Had there been the least doubt in Critopulos' mind that Cyril was indeed the author of the "Confessio", he would have certainly refused to affix

his signature to that document. If the Act of the Synod of Constantinople bears the signature of the Patriarch of Alexandria, this can only mean that in the mind of Cyril's contemporaries, friends as well as foes, there was not the shade of a doubt that the "Confessio" was his own work.

In still another sense the "Confessio" became a sign spoken against. Some of the scholars who accept that the book is a genuine work of Lucaris maintain, nevertheless, that the book does not give expression to Cyril's real feelings and convictions and they attribute to Cyril very mean motives in connection with the writing of it. The first to attribute such motives to Lucaris was the well-known Hugo Grotius, who in his "Votum pro pace ecclesiastica" (22) says that "that Cyril of Constantinople was moved by considerations political, not theological", when he wrote his "Confessio". (23) The same line was followed by A. Arnauld (24), who says that "when Cyril was writing to de Wilhem in 1619....he was doing it against his own conscience." And further down: "The Calvinists of Geneva and Holland could not have approved that criminal dissimulation." It is not easy, however, to tell what exactly Arnauld thinks of Lucaris and his theological position, as in the same book (25) he says that it was an act of hypocrisy on his part when he accepted his appointment to the Ecumenical Throne, as "he should have regarded that office to be incompatible with the maxims of the religion which he was secretly professing to be the only true one."

To political motives is attributed the writing of the "Confessio" by G.J. Arvanitides, of modern writers. (26) A. Dia-

mantopoulos (27), although he rejects the genuineness of the "Confessio", leaves it open for one to surmise that Cyril, being in the need of powerful friends in his struggle against the Church of Rome, would probably be willing to make some sacrifice in the matter of his religious principles, in order to secure the help of the Protestant powers. That this is an unwarrantable judgement is evident to any one who has even the remotest acquaintance with Lucaris and his work. For why should Lucaris make concessions in the matter of principles, in order to secure the protection of the Protestant powers, when these, for reasons of their own, were only too anxious to grant him that protection and make him their ally against the French ambitions in the Near East? Whatever else Lucaris may not have been, he certainly was a clever man, and it could not have taken him a very long time to realise that his interests coincided with the interests of England and Holland and in the Near East and that he could be sure of the support of these two powers, without going as far as publishing a Calvinistic Confession of Faith.

A last point remains to be considered in connection with the "Confessio". Granted that Lucaris was the author of the book and that he wrote it not from questionable motives, but in order to give expression to his religious convictions, the question is raised: Was Cyril entitled to attribute these convictions to the Greek Church as a whole and to present his "Confessio" not as an exposition of his own individual beliefs but as an outline of the faith of the Greek Church itself?

In answering this question we have to bear in mind that in connection with the Greek Church and its doctrine there



had never taken place what the Council of Trent had done for the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent had crystalized in a clear and definite way the dogma of the Roman Church, while the doctrine of the Greek Church was left in a fluid condition. According to the Greek Church it is only an Ecumenical Council which has the authority to define the doctrine of the Church, and since an Ecumenical Council had not met for many centuries, the official doctrine of the Greek Church had been left at a stratum very distant from the minutely defined dogma of the Church of Rome. In the course of time many practices had, of course, crept into the ritual of the Greek Church, which were more in accordance with the Roman tradition than with the simplicity of the Evangelical belief. These practices, however, were lacking and are still lacking the sanction of an Ecumenical Council, and, strictly speaking, they cannot be considered to be part of the doctrine of the Greek Church.

There seems to have existed at the time of which we are speaking the habit for every one who published a Confession of his Faith to ascribe that Confession to the whole Greek ~~Faith~~ Church. This practice was followed by Critogulo s (28), Dositheus of Jerusalem (29) and Moghilla (30), but, to quote Professor Hamilcar Alivisatos of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Athens (31) : " The so-called Orthodox Confessions, usually cited both by Orthodox and non-orthodox writers as official statements of orthodox doctrine, are no longer recognized as such by most modern theologians, because ....these confessions have not the authority of an Ecumenical Synod." And Professor J. Carmiris, of the chair of Symbolic s, in the same University, (32) dealing with the Confession which

Metrophanes Critopulos published, exonerates him from having misrepresented the doctrine of the Greek Church, because, as he says, "the Greek Church had not as yet taken an official attitude towards the questions which had been raised by the Reformation, nor had the Greek theologians inquired into, and defined in an exact way the points on which the Greek Church differed from, and those on which it was in agreement with, the Protestant Churches."

Such being the case, it follows that Cyril's "Confessio", although in most of its chapters was undoubtedly not in agreement with the popular religious feeling of his time, which had been very deeply influenced by the teaching of the Roman Church, nevertheless could claim for itself that it stood much nearer the official standards of the Greek Church, as these were set down by the Ecumenical Councils, than the works of his Romanising adversaries did. It will be remembered that Cyril himself, in his answer to the challenge of the French ambassador, had stated that he was prepared to examine the contents of his "Confessio" only in the light of the Scriptures and the early Fathers of the Church. If these are the authorities of the doctrine of the Greek Church, Cyril was not far wrong when he claimed his "Confessio" to be the expression of the doctrine of the Greek Church.

.....

Footnotes to Chapter 9.

. . .

- (1) Legrand, op.cit., IV, 352-353.
- (2) Legrand, ibid.
- (3) Legrand, op.cit. 357
- (4) Legrand, op.cit. 360-361.
- (5) Legrand, op.cit., 361-365.
- (6) Legrand, op.cit., 365-369.
- (7) Legrand, op.cit., 377-379.
- (8) Smith's "Collectanea", 42-43.
- (9) Legrand, op.cit., 380-2.
- (10) 71-73.
- (11) To be found in the Vatican Library, Barb. 3506.
- (12) Vol. II, 292.
- (13) p. 554.
- (14) "Cyril Lucaris", 105.
- (15) "Cyril Lucaris the Cretan", 53.
- (16) "Modern Greek Literature", 238.
- (17) "Cyril Lucaris", 62.
- (18) "Κύριλλος Λούκαρις, ὁ Οἰκουµενικὸς Πατριάρχης", Athens 1859.
- (19) "Corrections to Satha's "Modern Greek Literature",
- (20) "The Confession of Cyril Lucaris", Athens 1906.

- (21) Aymon, op. cit. 27 - 36.
- (22) I64<sub>2</sub>, 57.
- (23) See also A. Rivetus, "Apologeticus pro schismate contra Votum pacis facti", Irenopoli. 1645, 10.
- (24). "La perpetuite de la Foi de l' Eglise Catholique", Vol . VIII, ch. 3, 543, 545.
- (25) 544.
- (26) Op. cit. 87, 88.
- (27) Op. cit. 33.
- (28) E. J. Kimmel, "Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis", Part II, I.
- (29) E. J. Kimmel, Op. cit. Part, I, 56.
- (30) See his "Confessio" in Schaff, "Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches", 175-400.
- (31) "The Ministry and the Sacraments" , London, 1937, 68.
- (32) "Metrophanes Critopulos" , 169-170.

.....



## Chapter 10

### More attacks by fellow-countrymen.

---

Had Urban VIII and the "Propaganda" the slightest desire to relax their warfare against Cyril, in the hope that they might be able by the use of more diplomatic means to win him over to their side, as they had done with so many other Greek clerics in the past, the appearance of Cyril's "Confessio" must have put an end to such a hope. Even if there were the shadow of a doubt in the mind of the Pope and his advisers as to where Cyril actually stood, that doubt was now removed. Furthermore, it was clear that the open declaration which Cyril had made of his faith, through the publication of his "Confessio", made it difficult for him to change <sup>his</sup> attitude to the Roman Church, even if he were inclined to do so. Therefore the duty of the Pope and the "propaganda" was clear. As the Roman Catholic historian Von Pastor puts it (1), Cyril "constituted so imminent a peril for the Union that it was a duty for the Holy See to do its utmost to get him removed from the Patriarchal See." New decisions were, therefore, taken against the hated Patriarch. The execution of the decisions, however, from now onwards would be entrusted not to the familiar hands of the French ambassador, but to those of the

ambassador of the Emperor. The French ambassador, it is true, does not altogether disappear from our narrative; he will have now and then some small part to play in giving effect to Rome's designs against Lucaris. The centre of interest, however, has decidedly moved from the French Embassy to that of the Emperor.

This change of scenery in Constantinople was not simply due to the fact that de Desy had suffered such a remarkable defeat in the matter of Metaxas and the Jesuits. That must have gone, no doubt, a long way to persuade the "Propaganda" that "notwithstanding all his zeal, de Desy could not overthrow Lucaris single-handed." (2) Other factors, however, which were operating nearer Rome, must have contributed to the change. For a long time an open feud existed between the two faithful daughters of Rome - France and Austria. This created for Rome a delicate state of affairs, which made it necessary for the Curia to handle things very tactfully, so that one Catholic Power should be balanced against the other to the profit of Rome. Other Popes before Urban VIII had faced the same problem, such as Clement VIII who, on the question of giving absolution to Henry IV, faced the problem of how to befriend the King of France, without giving offence to the Spaniards. (3) And in dealing with a similar difficult situation Pope Leo X is reported to have said that "when a man has formed a compact with one party, he must none the less take care to negotiate with the other." (4) On the accession however, of Urban VIII things had reached a climax, (5) and at a moment when the balance slightly favoured Austria, the decision was taken to take the initiative in the matter of

Lucaris out of the hands of the French ambassador and commit it to the ambassador of Austria.

This coincided with the arrival in Constantinople of a new Austrian ambassador. The old ambassador baron ~~von~~ von Kuefstein was a Protestant; he did not become a Roman Catholic until 1629. Rudolph Schmidt, however, who succeeded him in Constantinople in 1629 (6) was eager to lend his assistance to the promotion of Rome's plans against the Patriarch, so much the more as this was in accord with a campaign which the Austrian embassy had just started, with a view of appropriating for the Emperor the right of protection of the Christian populations in Turkey, which so far had been a privilege of France. The French ambassador, in order to forestall his Austrian colleague, gave the order<sup>t</sup> that prayers should be regularly offered for the King of France in all Roman Catholic Churches in Constantinople. Rudolph Schmidt imitated him at once and this led to protests on the part of the French ambassador and the creation of a confused and unpleasant state of things for the Roman Catholics in the Turkish capital. (7) Such was the atmosphere in which the fate of Lucaris and of his movement of reformation was decided.

Shortly after Cyril's encounter with the French ambassador over the matter of his "Confessio", about which we spoke in the previous chapter, two Greek bishops arrived in Constantinople (8). They were the metropolitans of Sophia and of Achrida<sup>Ochrida</sup>, who, according to Haga, had been obliged to forsake their own country, on account of the evil life which they led, and take refuge in Rome. There, according to the same authority, the Pope and the "Propaganda" were not slow in enlisting them as tools in their warfare against the

Patriarch of Constantinople. When they arrived in that city they were given hospitality at the French Embassy and immediately they started their operations. They began by spreading the rumour that Cyril was a "heretic", a "Lutheran" and an "infidel". Shortly afterwards they made it known ~~that~~ to the Greek bishops who had the right of electing the Patriarch in their hands that Rome intended to purchase the Patriarchate from the Turkish authorities by the payment of an annual sum of money and to appoint as a Patriarch a man who would be willing to pay homage to the Roman See.

Whether there was any truth in the story that Rome intended to "purchase" the Patriarchate, it is difficult to say. Still more difficult it is to guess whether the Turks would be willing to sell at a fixed sum of money an office which had proved very profitable to them. This is, however, just another indication of the disrepute to which the office of the Patriarch had fallen by means of the petty-mindedness and the rivalries of the Greeks themselves. However, Cyril could not ignore such a serious threat and he was obliged to take measures to avert the danger.

Unfortunately his great friend, Sir Thomas Roe, was no longer in Constantinople and one can imagine how Cyril missed his wise counsel and strong protection in those anxious days. Sir Thomas Roe's successor in the Embassy, Sir Peter Wych, was very friendly towards Cyril and de Mesy in a letter to de Chavigny (9) mentions that in 1635 the Patriarch baptized a son of the ambassador, to whom he gave his own name, Cyril. Now, however, under the influence of Laud, English policy was much less inclined to associate itself



with Calvinistic projects on the Continent, (10) and in spite of the friendliness which was shown to him by the English Ambassador, Cyril, soon discovered that he could no longer expect any real support from him.

There was left to him, however, von Haga, the Dutch ambassador, and to the very end Cyril enjoyed this man's friendship and support. Speaking of von Haga, Cyril says: "The illustrious Cornelius von Haga....having towards me a pure friendship....did not miss any opportunity to show his love to us in all our calamities." (11) It does not appear, however, that on this occasion von Haga's services were sought for. Cyril confined himself in communicating with the bishops and other influential people of his own Church, to whom he made known the new danger which was now threatening them and the decision was taken to have this new machination of the agents of Rome revealed to the Grand Vizir. This was accordingly done and by the intervention of the Grand Vizir the danger was averted. Whether the payment of a certain sum of money was also required for the securing of the favour of the Grand Vizir our sources do not tell us. It would be very surprising, however, if it was not.

Not long was Cyril left, however, to enjoy peace. Another enemy now made his appearance - Cyril Contari, Bishop of Berroea, /ot our well-known Berroea of Macedonia, but the town of Syria now known to us as Aleppo. Cyril Contari was a disciple of the Jesuits (12), whose blind obedience to Rome succeeded to enrage almost every section of the Greek Church (13) . Contari was later to become Rudolph Schmidt's favourite candidate for the Ecumenical Throne and it is of interest to see

just what Rudolph Schmidt was thinking of his protege :  
"He is a good and virtuous prelate: too good towards the  
evil ones and too severe towards the virtuous. Generous,  
when it is not necessary for him to be, and stingy when  
he should have been showing some liberality." (14) It  
was the unholy alliance of these two men, the ambassador  
of the Emperor of Austria and the Bishop of Berroea, which  
was to bring about at last the death of Cyril and the end  
of his work. At this present stage, however, it is not quite  
clear whether Contari made use of the assistance of Schmidt.

This is how it happened that Contari became Lucaris' enemy. Contari had been appointed by the Patriarch as a  
locum tenens of the vacant See of Thessalonica and when the  
See was to be permanently filled Contari applied for it, but  
Lucaris refused this request, as he destined the See for  
Athanasius Patellarus, about whom more will be said presently.  
Contari was deeply hurt by the refusal of his request and  
he decided to avenge himself. When, therefore, Cyril sent  
him to Russia and other countries to collect funds for the  
Church of Constantinople, he embezzled the money which he  
collected and proceeded to make use of it in October 1633 to  
procure for himself the Patriarchal Throne. Cyril was ejected  
from the See and this was occupied by Contari. Not for long,  
however, because Contari failed to raise the whole sum of money  
which he had promised to the Turks and, after having enjoyed  
the title of an Ecumenical Patriarch for seven days, he was  
deposed and was exiled to the island of Tenedos. (15)

Cyril came therefore back to his own - for a short  
time. In March 1634 he received another attack, once again

from a fellow-countryman of his own, from whom he had reasons to expect gratitude. From Anastasius Patellarus himself - the man, for whose sake he had provoked the anger of Contari. Patellarus was a Cretan, quite famous for his erudition (16) and a great supporter of the Romanising party within the Greek Church. (17) Having been elevated to the office of Archbishop of Thessalonica by Cyril himself, he forgot in the course of time all debt of gratitude which he owed to this man and he in his turn aspired to the Ecumenical Throne. He offered to the Turkish authorities to buy the office and when these showed themselves unwilling to reduce even by one cent, as Smith very graphically puts it, the price at which they had offered to sell the Throne to Contari, Patellarus paid the whole sum of money and entered into the Patriarchal office.

Cyril was sent to exile to the island of Tenedos. This was the third time that Cyril was ejected from his See and the second time he was sent into exile. (18) He did not stay long in Tenedos, but he stayed long enough to exchange at least one letter with his new friend A. Leger of the Dutch Embassy. In a letter which he addressed to Leger from the island of his exile on the 18th March 1634 (19) Cyril thanks his friend for the letter which he had sent him - "it gave me a great consolation in my exile" - as well as for a few books which Leger had sent him.

The Dutch Embassy, however, did not confine itself in sending books and letters of consolation to the exiled Patriarch. They took measures to have him brought back to his See, and in three months' time, in the month of June, "with

the great help of his friends and the payment of a large sum of money, Cyril came back to his own." (20)

- o -

- o -

While he is in exile, it is convenient for us to have a closer look of the man, for in a short time we shall lose sight of him. He is now in his sixty second year. In a picture of him, which was made at the year of his Eenedos exile and which is now to be found in Stockholm (21), probably the latest picture which we possess of Lucaris, the Patriarch is shown as a big man, with a long beard, with a serious looking face and thoughtful, one should rather say melancholy, eyes. In another picture, which in all probability was made two years earlier and is now found in the Salle Lullin of Geneva, the Patriarch is again depicted as a big man with a noble face; in his eyes, however, one cannot detect any trace of melancholy - they are illuminated by a lively spark, which one should almost call humour. And in this, the earlier picture seems to have preserved more accurately, if not the features of the Patriarch's face, at any rate the disposition of his spirit.

For Cyril was a man gifted with a deep sense of humour, which he preserved to the very end. We have already seen how in his letter to Uytenbogaert, 10 October 1613, he compares the success which the Jesuits had in Constantinople with that of foxes amongst poultry - "et proficiant quot vulpes inter gallinas". In the same letter he gives an account of the visits which the "Jabuna", the chief of the Copts in Egypt, had paid him while he was Patriarch of Alexandria, and he can hardly restrain his mirth when he remem-



bers the sombre, long face of that silent "Jabuna". " Never does one see him open his mouth, for he does not consider it permissible to a Jabuna to speak outside his own house.... All he does is to move his head forward or backward, as a sign of approval or disapproval of what he is being told.... And as for the visits he paid me, he went away as dumb as he had come - 'quoties venit, mutus venit, mutus abiit'. As for myself, I love speaking - 'ego loquax et garrulus sum'. I think it is my duty to speak for myself and not let others do it for me. What, however, I most dislike in that good man is that <sup>of</sup> the whole of his face he only permits me to see his eyes; the rest he keeps covered.... as if by a mask of the theatre." (22)

In the same letter speaking with contempt of some of the doctrines of the Roman Church, he says "while the Papists teach that no one can be certain of his salvation, they insist that the Greeks should be certain of their damnation."

Of his humour he makes frequent use to attack his opponents, and he can be very caustic sometimes in his sarcasm. Writing to his friend A. Leger on the 15th July 1635 from the island of Rhodes, where he is once again in ~~xxx~~ exile, he remembers Athanasius Patellarus, the man who showed his gratitude to him by offering to purchase for himself the patriarchal dignity, and he calls him not "Patellarus", but "that Athanasius Peshkesh, who has gone in great haste to Rome to receive unto himself, as he says, the Cardinal's hat, which they will give him for having deposed a Calvinist Patriarch." (23) From the same island he gives an account of a discussion he had on questions of theology, while in

Chios, with some person, Coressios by name, "that little genius of a theologian". (24) One will not have much difficulty in forgiving Cyril for his sarcasm when he finds him, in a letter which he penned one year before his martyrdom, calling the "Propaganda Fide" of Rome, at whose hands he had suffered so much, "The Congregation for the Propagation of Infidelity." (25)

This outflow of sarcasm only shows how human Cyril was - a man of a large heart and warm disposition. Cyril had a heart which was always ready to forgive his enemies and offer of the best of his treasure to his friends. Just a short time before he was sent for the second time into exile, he received a letter from Cyril Contari, the man who had hurt him so deeply and who was to become later the agent that brought about his death. Contari is now in exile in Tenedos and he pretends in his letter to have repented for the wrong which he had done Lucaris and he implores him to pardon him. Without a moment's hesitation the good Patriarch sent to the evil, exiled man a message of a full and free pardon. (26)

In an equally full measure Cyril extended his love to his friends and to the cause for which he was fighting. To Uytenbogaert he says that he "cannot speak too much" when he speaks of religion. (27) And one has to read his letter of 20th March 1618 to David le Leu de Wilhem (28) to see what feelings Cyril had for his friends and in what a beautiful way he could express them.

One cannot go through Cyril's correspondence without being struck with another beautiful trait of his person-

ality, namely his deep and genuine humility. Cyril was by no means a common man. He had received an education, to which few in his time had attained. He was called to the highest offices his Church could offer him. He was honoured by the friendship of some of the great men of his time and by the hatred of others, while he kept correspondence with many more. It would not have been unnatural, if Cyril had been just a little conscious of his achievements and his position. Such a feeling, however, nowhere in his letters is betrayed. While he was Patriarch of Alexandria, he received a letter from Uytenbogaert, in which, it seems, the Dutch divine expressed himself with some warmth about the talents with which people were telling him that Cyril was adorned. In a very gracious and slightly humorous way Cyril disclaimed the possession of such talents. (29)

"And I must add, my dear sir, that as regards the talents with which you have heard that God has favoured me, you must not imagine that I really possess them. I would much rather possess those I am lacking. Therefore you should not attribute those good things you have heard about me, but to the love of those who reported them to you. One must be content, however, with what God has been pleased to give him."

In a letter to de Wilhem (30) he complains that he does not himself possess the beautiful and elegant style which adorns the letters of his friend, and in the same letter he insists that de Wilhem should treat him, the Patriarch of Alexandria, on terms of familiarity and he expresses his gratitude for the enlightenment he had received from de Wilhem's letters on certain truths which he had formerly ignored. In

another letter to the same friend (31) he does not hesitate to confess that the light which he possesses on the doctrine of Predestination is very poor indeed.

This brings out another remarkable line in his character. His insatiable thirst for learning. There pass before our eyes pictures of a little Cretan boy, who, after his return from Venice to his home-island unearthed a few books which his teacher Margunios had left there and devoured them, while he was waiting for an opportunity to resume his studies in Italy, and of a young student at the University of Padua, who gave part of his little time of leisure to discussing various problems of philosophy in letters which he exchanged with his old teacher. This spirit did not forsake Cyril to the end of his life. No sooner did he make a new friend than, as a rule, he asked him to lend him some books. The mere names of books which he borrowed from his friends on Theology, Philosophy, Mathematics and the Arts make an impressive list. In a letter to de Wilhem he says: I have no other ambition, no other desire, but always to acquire some new knowledge = nihil ambio, nihil sitio, nisi ut semper aliquid discam." (32) And to Leger he writes from Rhodes on the 25th June 1635 a letter (33), in which he puts to him a whole series of questions on various points of his private study of the Bible, which one would rather connect in one's mind with the quiet of the study than with the hardships of an exile.

And the knowledge which Cyril expects to gain from his studies he does not covet for his own selfish satisfaction, but in order to place it at the disposal of others and thus



be in a better position to fulfil his high office as a Pastor of the Church of God. "Those to whom this care is committed, he writes to Uytenbogaert (34) should work the work of an Evangelist and fulfil their ministry with soberness." For, he says in another letter to the same person (35) "although both you and I are pastors, we are nevertheless subject to the Sovereign Pastor, to Whom we belong as sheep and by Whom we must be edified, if we are to be Pastors."

Such was the man who for a brief space of time shone as a bright and beautiful star in the dark sky of Greece. Deeply human in his affection, conscious of his limitations and always eager to learn, humble at once and proud, with a deep love for the truth and an equally great love for his Motherland and with one great ambition and desire - to be used by God to bring to his fellow-countrymen the light of the Gospel. How far this ambition was materialized will be the subject of another chapter.

.....

Footnotes to Chapter 10

. . . .

- (1) Op. cit. Vol. XXIX, 237.
- (2) Von Pastor, op. cit. XXIX, 238.
- (3) Ranke, History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries, Vol. II, 47-48; see also page 97.
- (4) Ranke, op. cit. Vol. I, 64.
- (5) A. O. Legge, "The Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy", 133)
- (6) Evdoxiu de Hurmuzaki, "Documente privitoare la Istoria Romanilor", Vol. IV, part I. 682-683.
- (7) Hammer, op. cit. Vol. IX, 282.
- (8) Smith, op. cit. 54-55; Lettre du Sieur von Haghe in "Collectanea", 73-74; Le Quien, op. cit. II, 304-305.
- (9) National Library of Paris, 16155-195, as quoted by G. Arvanitides, op. cit. 122).
- (10) J. M. Neale, "A History of the Holy Eastern Church, Vol. II, 438.
- (11) G. Hoffmann, op. cit. 99-100.
- (12) Aymon, op. cit. 102; L. Allatius, op. cit. Lib. 3, cap. II, sect. 5, p. 1077.
- (13) Smith, op. cit. 57.
- (14) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 685-686.
- (15) Aymon, op. cit. 102; Smith, op. cit. 55; Le Quien, op. cit. Vol. II, 333.
- (16) Le Quien, op. cit. I. 334.
- (17) Smith, op. cit. 56.

- (18) Smith, op. cit. 56; Le Quien, op. cit. I, 334.
- (19) Aymon, op. cit. 56-57.
- (20) Smith, op. cit. 56.
- (21) From Rudolph Schmidt we learn that Cyril had some correspondence with the King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden and this fact explains the presence of his picture in Stockholm.
- (22) Aymon, op. cit. 158.
- (23) Aymon, op. cit. 100-102.
- (24) Aymon, op. cit. 85-87.
- (25) Aymon, op. cit. 115-119.
- (26) Smith, op. cit. 55.
- (27) Aymon, op. cit. 135
- (28) Aymon, op. cit. 188-192.
- (29) Aymon, op. cit. 134-135.
- (30) Aymon, op. cit. 172-175.
- (31) Aymon, op. cit. 183-184.
- (32) Aymon, op. cit. 172-175.
- (33) Aymon, op. cit. 85-87.
- (34) Aymon, op. cit. 160
- (35) Aymon, op. cit. 127.

. . . . .

## Chapter II

### The Two Cyrils

. . . .

What remains of Lucaris' story could well be described as "the struggle between the two Cyrils" - Cyril Lucaris and Cyril Contari.

In the month of June 1634 - as we saw in the previous chapter, Cyril returned from his second exile and was reinstated on the Patriarchal Throne. He was not permitted long, however, to occupy the See, for new troubles broke out early in 1635. The exact date of these new troubles is not given us by our authorities. Smith (1) confines himself in just giving the year. Le Quien (2), on the other hand, says that the troubles occurred one year after the return of Lucaris to Constantinople - "anno elapso" ; in this, however, he is not altogether accurate, as we possess letters written by Lucaris in Chios and Rhodes during his third exile, as early as in April 1635. It may be safe to place, with Hoffmann (3) the troubles in March 1635.

As soon as Contari found himself back in Constantinople, he promptly forgot the hardships of the exile in Tenedos and his professed repentance for the harm he had done to



Lucaris and the generous pardon he had received at the hands of his victim and, being incited by the representatives of Rome (4) he resumed his efforts to secure for himself the Throne of Constantinople.

As things had developped, this was not a difficult thing to secure, provided the money could be found, wherewith to pay the " Peshkesh" to the Turkish authorities. This Contari managed to find - it is not known whence, as our authorities have nothing to say on this; most probably, however, with the help of his Roman friends. At any rate fifty thousand dollars were paid to the Turkish authorities (5) and Cyril Contari found himself for the second time on the Ecumenical Throne, while Cyril Lucaris found himself for the third time on the road to the exile.

That some attempt was made against Lucaris' life before he was eventually sent into exile, is evident from the fact that as soon as he reached the island of Chios, the first stage of his journey, he wrote a letter to A. Leger, in which he gave thanks for "having been delivered out of the ~~in~~ hands of his enemies." (6) Rudolph Schmidt himself, in one of his reports to the Emperor Ferdinand III on the affair Lucaris, (7) says that the Patriarch was at that time imprisoned for six days in a secret place at the absolute disposal of Contari. One of the bishops made the suggestion, in the presence of the Austrian ambassador, that they should kill Lucaris, or at least they should blind him and thus incapacitate him permanently for the office of the Patriarch. This suggestion was not approved, Schmidt says, either by himself

or by Contari. The reason, however, for which the Austrian ambassador withheld his approval, as he himself discloses it in his report to the Emperor, is that very near where Cyril was kept as a prisoner some influential Greeks had their dwellings, who would certainly hear the cries of Lucaris, "and God only knows in what an unpleasant situation I might have found myself."

Schmidt, however, made another suggestion. Contari, or as Schmidt calls him for convenience's sake, the Patriarch of Berroea, would have to dispose of some money in order to secure a ship manned by sailors whom they could trust and who, while pretending to be taking Lucaris to Rhodes or Cyprus, would lead him to Rome. The Porte would easily be persuaded to issue the Passports and other necessary permits, in order to have the Patriarch sent to one of the islands in the Archipelago, as it had been done on previous occasions. After that some arrangement would have to be made with some Turk, whom they could trust and who would see to it that the ship did not proceed to Rhodes or Cyprus, but to Malta or to the first ship of "Christian Pirates", which they might come across in the open sea. In order that neither the Turks nor the crew of the ship should run the risk of being hurt by the pirates, the Austrian Ambassador would furnish them with the necessary letters of recommendation and permits. Soon after the ship's departure from Constantinople, the rumour would be skillfully diffused that the ship had an encounter with Maltese pirates, who led Lucaris away to their island.

Contari gave his approval to this plan and left to

the Austrian ambassador the care of finding a suitable ship and a trustworthy crew for it. Schmidt was not slow in concluding the business and soon a bargain was closed : eight hundred dollars for the ship and five hundred for the crew, the first sum to be paid straightaway, the second to be paid as soon as the ship came back. Contari, however, found the sum that was required of him too large, and after some time he sent word to Schmidt to the effect that he had arranged for the transportation of Lucaris to Rome at much cheaper terms and he asked for the permits and the letters of recommendation to the "Christian Pirates". Schmidt sent the letters, "not, however, without some fear that some mismanagement might give the whole affair a bad turn." And what Schmidt was afraid of did eventually happen.

While Contari was searching for a cheaper ship, the Dutch Ambassador, through his spies, "who, Schmidt complains, are to be found everywhere", was informed of the plan and he was able to bribe the crew of the ship Contari had chartered and to secure their promise that as soon as they were out in the open sea, the bishop who was to accompany Cyril on his journey to the "Christian Pirates" would find himself "a prisoner of his prisoner". On the fixed day Cyril was embarked on the ship and this put out to sea. With a favourable wind it soon arrived at Chios and there the Governor of Rhodes, who was spending a few days there and who was a friend of the Dutch ambassador and the knew of Schmidt's plan and Haga's counter-plan, gave Lucaris a warm welcome and sent the escorting bishop back to Constantinople in great shame. (7)



Cyril was left in exile, in Rhodes, up to the month of July of the following year, 1636. That was a trying time for him. The persecutions and the hardships he had suffered began to tell on his spirit. "I am in a garden, he writes to his friend Leger, and I taste of the fruits thereof, and they are all full of bitterness and pain." (8) A vague feeling of what was in store for him in the near future had already crept into his mind : "These men know well that they cannot have success in their plans, so long as I am alive.....Your prayers will be a great help to me.....Nothing will happen to me, which God will not permit me to suffer." (9) And in another letter : "I lift my eyes to heaven, from whence cometh my help, as to all those who put their trust on the Almighty." (10)

While he was in that garden with the bitter fruits, however, he did not lose sight of the matters which were uppermost in his heart. He writes to Leger : "I have nothing to sustain me, but the contemplation of spiritual things." He tells Leger how he had been saddened when a fellow-countryman of his in Chios, during a conversation which he had with him, expressed the view that "Jesus Christ is only one of the Mediators, but there others beside Him, less important, who also intercede for us." In the same letter he expresses himself very strongly against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which "out of a piece of bread creates a Jesus Christ," (11)

At this trying time Leger's friendship meant much for him and the letters which he received from his Swiss friend were a source of consolation for him, as he himself



admits. Shortly after his arrival in Rhodes he received the manuscript of a book written by his friend on the subject of the Lord's Supper and he enjoyed so much its reading, that he asked for the permission to have it translated into modern Greek and circulated among his own people. (12) A few months later Nathaniel Conopius, a friend and follower of Lucaris, was writing to Leger that he will shortly translate Leger's treatise "against the Papist Transubstantiation." It is very likely that it is the same book, about which Cyril had written from his exile and which he now asked his friend Conopius to translate. (13)

Back in Constantinople, Cyril Contari, having found himself an Ecumenical Patriarch, "Imperatoris Turcarum et Romani Pontificis gratia", as Smith would have it, (14) gave himself over unrestrainedly to the enjoyment of his triumph. Banquets were organized for him and his friends and it seems that at these banquets Contari did not set a very high example of sobriety. He also adopted a high-handed policy towards the clergy under him and he persecuted the friends of Lucaris, some of whom he succeeded to have imprisoned. By these methods it was not long before he alienated the spirits of the influential people of the Church. This is testified not only by Smith (15), whose friendly attitude towards Lucaris is well-known, but also by Contari's supporter Rudolph Schmidt, who, in his report to the Emperor (16) gives an account of the foolish way in which Contari behaved while he occupied the Ecumenical Throne. What infuriated a large part of the clergy against him was the fact that in

March 1636 he convened a Synod, in which he pronounced Lucaris deposed and anathematized. These copies of the decision of this Synod were despatched to Rome, one by the Roman Patriarchal Vicar in Constantinople, another by the ambassador Rudolph Schmidt and a third one by a Jesuit of Chios. (17)

At last a revolt broke out among the bishops in Constantinople against Contari. For a few weeks some confusion prevailed, but eventually the rebel bishops won and having convened a Synod they condemned Contari. (18) Thus was Contari deposed, after he had occupied the See for sixteen months, and he was sent into exile by the same ship, in which Lucaris was to return to Constantinople. On the 2nd July 1636 Leger was writing to the Society of the Pastors in Geneva: "We are now waiting for the return of the Confessor from his exile in Rhodes by the same ship, which will carry there the pseudo-patriarch." (19)

Cyril returned indeed to Constantinople, but for some reason which is not quite clear - most probably it had to do with the famous "Peshkesh" - he was not permitted to occupy at once the Throne. Thus on January 12th 1637, six whole months after Cyril's return to Constantinople, Nathaniel Conopius was writing to Leger in Geneva: "One of these days his Reverence will return to the Throne." (20) In the meantime the See was occupied by Neophytus, Archbishop of Heracleia. It is not often that in the course of Lucaris' story one comes across a noble face. It is, therefore, with a sense of relief that we take note of the entrance of Neophytus into this narrative of meanness, intrigue and hatred.

Neophytus was a disciple of Lucaris. (21) He shared Cyril's evangelical views, as is made clear in Leger's letter to the Pastors in Geneva (2nd July 1636): "He is more recommended by the integrity of his character than by his erudition; nevertheless he has such a high opinion of the "Confession" of his master, that in Crete, their common native-land, the enemies of the truth are branding him with the same heresies." (22) Neophytus had a deep respect and affection for his teacher, and he is one of the very few, who did not repay Cyril's kindness by ingratitude. While Cyril was in Rhodes, Neophytus took a prominent part in the efforts which were made to secure the return of the exiled Patriarch. And when the Patriarch at last came, only to find that he would not be permitted to occupy his See for some time, Neophytus occupied it, having made it clear that this was a provisional arrangement and that he would retire, as soon as the lawful Patriarch would be permitted to exercise his duties. Le Quien (23) following Cygala, states that Neophytus acted as Patriarch for one year. Strictly speaking, however, Neophytus only acted as a Locum-tenens for Lucaris, and when in April 1637 the way was cleared for his master to return to the Throne, he promptly retired. (24)

The last chapter of Cyril's career was now about to open and Cyril, would have to face the adventures of this chapter with fewer friends around him than ever. For no sooner had he come back to Constantinople than Leger left it to return to his own country. Thus still another friend Cyril lost from his side, at a time when he most needed him.

In a letter which he addressed to the Society of the Pastors in Geneva on 17th August 1636, Cyril gave thanks for the work which Leger had done in their midst. He admits that he is now about to face many more troubles, but "the Lord is my Light and my Salvation, of whom shall I be afraid?" (25)

Shortly afterwards Leger's successor arrived from Geneva - a certain Mr. Sartoris, and on December 2nd 1636 the new chaplain to the Dutch ambassador was writing to the Society of the Pastors in Geneva, in order to express his appreciation of "the gracious welcome which was accorded to me by the Patriarch". (26) The joy and encouragement which the arrival of the new chaplain must have brought to Cyril, did not last, however, long, for a few months later, 8 September 1637, A Rivet was writing to Geneva to announce the death of the new chaplain.

. . . . .



Footnotes to Chapter II

. . . .

- (1) Op. cit. 56.
- (2) Op. cit. Vol. I, 334.
- (3) Op. cit. 33.
- (4) Smith, op. cit. as above.
- (5) Smith, op. cit. 57.
- (6) 4 April 1635, in Aymon, op. cit. 66-68.
- (7) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 683-684.
- ~~(6)~~ (7a) An account of the plan to have Cyril led away by pirates to Rome is also given by Smith, op. cit. 57-58, as well as by Lucaris himself in his letter to Leger, 26 April 1635, in Aymon, 77-78.
- (8) Aymon, op. cit. 100-102.
- (9) Aymon, op. cit. 77-78.
- (10) Aymon, op. cit. 100-102.
- (11) Aymon, op. cit. 66-68.
- (12) Aymon, op. cit. 85-87.
- (13) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 493.
- (14) Op. cit. 57.
- (15) Op. cit. 57.
- (16) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 684.
- (17) Hoffmann, op. cit. 33.
- (18) Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Analekta', IV, 98-99.
- (19) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 450.

- (20) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 493.
- (21) Smith, op. cit. 58; Le Quien, op. cit. I, 334.
- (22) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 450
- (23) Op. cit. as above.
- (24) M. Gedeon, "Lists of Patriarchs", 561. The exact date of Cyril's return to the See is not well established. Le Quien (op. cit. I, 334) says that Cyril exercised the Patriarchal authority for the last time for one year and five months. Seeing that Cyril's death occurred in June 1638, that would bring his restoration to the See for the last time back to January or February 1637.
- (25) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 458-459.
- (26) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 461.
- (27) Legrand, op. cit. IV, 498.

• • • •

## Chapter 12

### The Martyrdom.

. . . .

It was the spring of the year 1637 when Cyril was restored to his See for the last time. From letters which he wrote during his exile we can gather that he was not free of a vague feeling of fear about the future. (1) And his friends must have realized that the opponents of the Reformation movement within the Greek Church, who had so far been frustrated in their efforts to put out of the way the chief agent of that movement, would soon be obliged to have recourse to more radical measures against him. As Smith puts it (2), those people, being confronted with the courageous and robust spirit, with which Cyril had suffered so far exiles, imprisonments and other hardships and had shown himself superior to all these, came at last to the conclusion that "while he lived, all hope of their plans being successful was vain." It must have been early in that last term of Cyril's tenure of the office of the Patriarchate that the decision was taken to put him to death.

It is not easy to say who was the one who took the initiative in this last stage in the struggle against Lucaris. Greek Orthodox writers are anxious to cast all responsibility

upon the Austrian ambassador Rudolph Schmidt, clearing thus in some measure Cyril of Berroea of that ugly stain. (3) Roman Catholic historians, on the other hand, are equally anxious to lay upon Cyril Contari the whole responsibility for that crime. (4) The facts which we have at our disposal seem to show that both these men, each one in his own way, are responsible for having brought about Cyril's death.

Soon after Lucaris occupied the See, there began negotiations between Cyril Contari and Rudolph Schmidt as to how best they could secure the removal of the hated Patriarch. Schmidt offered to intercede with the Pope and the ~~the~~ "Propaganda" on behalf of Contari and solicit their assistance for him in his efforts to supplant the Calvinist Patriarch. As a result of Schmidt's intercession, the Pope and the "Propaganda" promised to give Contari financial assistance. There was, however, it seems, some delay in the despatch of the promised sum of money, for on October 2nd 1637 Contari was writing to Schmidt to complain that the "promised friends" (i.e. the money promised by the Holy See wherewith to bribe the Turkish authorities) had not yet arrived. Schmidt wrote at once to the Roman Catholic Patriarchal Vicar in Constantinople, to whom he conveyed Contari's complaints. (5) And there followed between these two men a correspondence, in which the same mutual distrust is manifest, which in an earlier stage of Cyril's story was manifested in the relations of the French ambassador in Constantinople with the special envoy of the Holy See, Cannachio Rossi.



Many months were spent in espionage, as Schmidt himself says in his above mentioned report, but neither Schmidt nor Contari felt quite safe to deal the last blow against Lucaris. And the reason for this indecision on their part was the fact that they were afraid that, so long as the Sultan and the Grand Vizir were in Constantinople, the way would always be open for the English and the Dutch ambassadors to take swift measures in order to counteract any success they might be able to secure in their efforts against Lucaris. (6) They decided, therefore, to bide their time, waiting for an opportunity when the Sultan and the Grand Vizir might be away from Constantinople and not easily accessible to the English and the Dutch friends of the Patriarch.

The opportunity, for which the two conspirators were waiting, was not long in presenting itself. On the Throne of the Empire there was now the young Sultan Murad IV, about whom more will be said presently. Under the leadership of this strong and energetic man a new breath of life blew over Turkey. Murad took upon himself the leadership of the army in Asia and he started a campaign against the Persians, which led him from victory to victory. (7) In due time he attempted the recapture of Bagdad, which was still in the hands of the Persians. The preparations for this particular campaign completed, the Sultan started, on the 8th May 1638, at the head of his army from Scutari of Constantinople, with Bagdad as his goal. (8) The Sultan was preceded by the Grand Vizir Bairam Pasha, who left the capital for Asia Minor in order to prepare the way for his royal master and the large

military force under him. This was the opportunity, for which Contari and Schmidt had patiently waited for many months.

They despatched immediately into Asia Minor a Greek priest, by the name of Lamerno, who apparently had orders to make contact with the Grand Vizir, when this was at a safe distance from Constantinople and Cyril's friends. The meeting of Lamerno with the Grand Vizir, if we can make a conjecture from the time-table of the Suktan's progress through Asia Minor (9), must have taken place near the town of Konia, the ancient Iconium. And the meeting was made possible by means of rich presents, with which the Grand Vizir was bribed. This is testified by Smith, who, in his chapter on Cyril's death, bases his account both on Nathaniel Conopius' narrative - of which we shall presently speak, and on information which was given him by Edeard Pococke, Professor of Arabic in Oxford, who at the time of Lucaris' death was acting as chaplain to the English ambassador in Constantinople. (10)

It seems that Lamerno stayed at the place, where he had his audience with the Grand Vizir, long enough to be able to send to Constantinople reports of his proceedings, before the sentence of death was actually issued. Thus Rudolph Schmidt says in his report: "After a few days we were again together and the Patriarch whispered in my ear: 'My agent is writing me from Asia that Lucaris will have some difficulty in escaping death; what do you think of that?' I answered him that to my mind the Patriarch ought to do nothing, one way or another, but let things take their

course. The Patriarch then smiled and never again spoke to me on this subject. (11)

At last the efforts of Lamerno were crowned with success. The Grand Vizir had an opportunity of approaching the Sultan on the matter of Lucaris and a very good choice of his ground he made. It had once again to do with the famous Cosacks. The joy, with which the victories over the Persians had filled the heart of the Empire, was mitigated, just about the time we are speaking of, by the news that Asak, a town on the sea of Azov, had been besieged and captured by the Cocasks. (12) This was a blow for Murad, so much the more bitter, as, his hands being full with the Persian campaign, he could not avenge it immediately.

At this critical time, when even the mention of the name of the Cosacks would fill Murad with anger, it was insinuated to the Sultan by the Grand Vizir that the Greek Patriarch had something to do with the fall of Asak. In what exactly consisted Cyril's share in the fall of that town our authorities do not reveal to us. It was stated, however, to the Sultan that Cyril was keeping a secret correspondence with the Moscovites and the Cosacks and it was, further, stated that the presence of Cyril in Constantinople, at that time when the army was away, was dangerous, as he might incite the Greek population to revolt. (13) That was enough for Murad. Even a more sober person might have found it difficult under such circumstances to restrain himself. But Murad IV, now at the age of twenty-six, had already built up for himself a great record of crime and had won for himself the title of "The Nero of Turkey". (14)

He was "half-Greek", because his mother was Greek, and his favourite wife was also a Greek lady. (15) He came to the throne in 1623 and in the year in which Cyril's death occurred he had already committed a large part of his famous crimes. He had murdered his three brothers. (16) In the year 1637 it was computed that the number of his victims, many of whom he had executed with his own hand, rose to twenty-five thousand. (17) When he started on his campaign for the recapture of Bagdad, it is said that one could trace the route he took by the red line he left behind him - the blood of governors of provinces, judges and other officials, whom he had executed. (18) Shortly after he had sentenced Cyril to death, he was to accomplish the most horrible of all his crimes, when, at the capture of Bagdad, he put to death the whole of that town's garrison, amounting to ~~more~~ thirty thousand men, as well as a great number of its citizens. Such was the terror that that man inspired to those around him, that, as Ranke says (19), "his mutes were no longer to be distinguished from the other slaves of the Palace, for they all conversed now by signs." (20)

It is not to be wondered at if "that blood-thirsty tyrant.....did not respect the saintly character of the ~~the~~ Pastor of the Greek Church" (21). The sentence was issued that the Patriarch of Constantinople should be put to death and a messenger was despatched in all haste to the capital to bring the order to the Caimacam, the Governor of the city in the absence of the Grand Vizir to have the sentence executed. (22)



No! Musa Pasha, the Caimacam, despatched an officer and four soldiers to the Residence of the Patriarch, who seized Cyril and brought him to the Prison of the Seven Towers, on the Bosphorus, near the Black Sea. How long he was left there as a prisoner it is not easy to say with accuracy. Conopius's account might lead one to believe that he was only left there for a few hours. (24) Allatius, however, says that Cyril's execution occurred a few days - "paucis diebus" - after his imprisonment (25) and Rudolph Schmidt in his report to the Emperor says that the execution took place five days after the imprisonment. (26) At any rate, in the evening of the 27th June 1638 another detachment of soldiers came to the Castle to lead Cyril to the place of execution. Fearing lest the news should spread in the city and arouse the people to a sedition, the officer in charge told Cyril that they had orders to lead him by boat to the port of St. Stephanos, to the south of Constantinople, where he would be embarked on a ship to be led into exile. As soon, however, as the boat set sail, Cyril perceived that he was being led not into exile, but to his death. knelt down in the boat and and he started praying. (27)

It was dark when the boat reached a solitary point of the coast near St. Stephanos and the detachment of the soldiers landed, together with their prisoner. The order was given and the Patriarch was executed. Thus ended the life of Cyril Lucaris, at the age of sixty-six, on the 27th June (old style : 7th July, new style) 1638. Poesocke, in his Supplement to the "historiae Dynastiarum" gives the date as 27th January 1638, but, as himself informed Smith,

"January" was a misprint for "June". (28) The body of the Patriarch was buried by the soldiers near the coast and his belongings, in accordance with the custom which prevailed at the time, were distributed among the soldiers, who, on the following day, sold them in the market place in the city.

That was how the terrible news broke out in the city. At once multitudes of mourning people were assembled outside Contari's residence, shouting : "Pilate, give unto us the body of our dead one, that we may bury him." From Contari's house the crowd proceeded to the Residence of the Caimacam, to whom they offered money that he should give them the dead body of their Pastor. Contari, however, and his friends were afraid lest even the dead body of Lucaris might cause them some trouble, and they persuaded the Caimacam to refuse the request. One or two days later they sent their servants to ~~mark~~ the place of the execution, who dug Cyril's body out of the grave and they cast it into the sea. Some fishermen, however, saw the body floating on the sea, they recognized it and they brought it to the little island of St. Andrew, not far from Constantinople, on the Asiatic coast, where they buried it. (29)

The news was sent to the "Propaganda" in Rome by the Austrian Ambassador in his letter of 1st August 1638 (new style). (30) In that letter Schmidt speaks of two previous letters of his, in which he had announced the news of Cyril's imprisonment. These letters are, no doubt, to be found in the Archives of the "Propaganda" in Rome, and they might have some light to shed on the events which took place in the last days of Lucaris' life. Hoffmann, unfortunately,

did not publish them alongside with the others.

Schmidt can hardly suppress his joy in that letter: "Thus the wretched existence of that unfortunate old man received, by the just intervention of the Providence of God, its fitting retribution, through his shameful and miserable death." In his report to the Emperor he says: "As for me, I must admit that Lucaris' death did not displease me, for he was the chief assistant of the Dutch ambassador in his frequent interventions with the Porte." (31)

Contari, the chief agent of Cyril's tragic death, was not long left to enjoy his triumph. Soon after Sultan Murad's return to Constantinople, in June 1639, he was deposed and was sent to exile to Carthage, where he met with a miserable death. (32) Lamerno, in order to avoid a similar end, became a renegade. (33)

Contari was succeeded on the Ecumenical Throne by Parthenius I, who was a friend of Lucaris, and under him the Church had an opportunity of paying a belated tribute of honour to the memory of the great Patriarch. In 1641 the grave on the island of St. Andrew was opened and the remains were taken to be buried in the Monastery of the Holy Virgin on the Island of Halke. The funeral which took place in the Church of the Patriarchate was a solemn ceremony and it was attended by a great number of the people of the Royal City, who came to honour the memory of the Patriarch. (34) But the real farewell of Greece to the man, who, in one of her darkest hours, loved her, worked for her and at last laid down his life for her, was given in that simple act of devotion, when the hands of working men dug a solitary grave on the

shore of St. Andrew's and there they deposited the remains  
of Cyril Lucaris.

• • • • •



Footnotes to Chapter 12.

. . .

- (1) Aymon, op. cit.
- (2) Op. cit. 59.
- (3) G. Arvanitides, op. cit. 143-147.
- (4) Semnoz, op. cit. 103.
- (5) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. Vol. IV, Part I, 632.
- (6) Smith, op. cit. 59-60. See also in Legrand, op. cit. IV, 456-458, a letter of Lucaris himself to the Pastors in Geneva, dated 7 August 1636, in which he states that in order to secure his last exile to Rhodes, his enemies had to wait until the Sultan departed to Asia Minor.
- (7) Lavissee et Rambaud, op. cit. Vol. V, 874.
- (8) Hammer, op. cit. Vol. IX, 311.
- (9) Hammer, op. cit. Vol. IX, 315-316.
- (10) Smith, op. cit. 59.
- (11) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 685-686.
- (12) Ricaut, Histoire de l' Empire Ottoman, Vol. I, 119-120.
- (13) Smith, op. cit. 60; Conopius' letter to A. Leger, in Legrand IV 514-516; Ricaut, op. cit. 58.
- (14) Hammer, op. cit. Vol. IX, 5.
- (15) Lavissee et Rambaud, op. cit. Vol. V. 852.
- (16) Ogg, op. cit. 475.
- (17) L. Ranke, History of the Ottoman Empire in the 16th and 17th Centuries, 25.
- (18) Lavissee et Rambaud, op. cit. Vol. V, 852-853.

- (19) Op. cit. 25.
- (20) See also Pitton de Tournefort, "Relation d' un voyage du Levant", Vol. II, 287.
- (21) Hammer, op. cit. Vol. IX, 306.
- (22) Smith, op. cit. 60-61.
- (24) Op. cit. as above.
- (25) Op. cit. Lib. III, 1075
- (26) Hoffmann, op. cit. 107.
- (27) Smith, op. cit. 61.
- (28) Smith, op. cit. 61.
- (29) In the details of Cyril's death I follow chiefly the account of Conopius given in his above-mentioned letter to A. Leger. See also Nicolai Comneni Papadopoli, op. cit. Vol. II 294; Le Quien, op. cit. Vol. I, 334-335; L. Allatius, op. cit. Liber III, 1075; De la Croix, op. cit. 5-7.
- (30) Hoffmann, op. cit. 107.
- (31) Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 685-686.
- §32) See Schmidt's report: Hurmuzaki, op. cit. 689; Dositheus, "History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Ch. X, Bk XI, 1170; Semnoz, op. cit. 106; M. Gedeon, "Lists of Patriarchs", 568.
- (33) Arvanitides, op. cit. 139.
- (34) Smith op. cit. 62.

## Chapter I3

### Achievements and Assessments

.. . . .

There remains for us now to attempt ~~an~~ assessment of the measure of success which attended the work of Cyril Lucaris, and, in case we find this to be small, to enquire into the reasons for it.

That Lucaris' work had no great measure of success needs hardly be stated. That some of his ~~admirers~~ admirers today find it necessary, as it has been shown in an earlier chapter, to dissociate Lucaris from his work by refusing him the authorship of the "Confessio", and thus to clear his memory from the stain of the Reformation, is sufficient evidence that Lucaris' work made little impression on the minds of his people. It would be unjust, however, to say that Lucaris' work had no effect whatever on the life of his country, and that with the passing of Lucaris there vanished his work as well.

We have first to remember the handful of people who were impressed by Lucaris' work and embraced his message. We should first mention Meletios Pantogalos, the Archbishop of Ephesus. Pantogalos shared in a full measure the evangelical beliefs of Lucaris. In a letter of his to the clergy of Crete (I) Pantogalos calls Cyril "the good Pastor and wise Captain of the Church." As regards the

"Confessio<sup>n</sup>", he says that those people reject it who are unable to enter into its full meaning. "Were not our Fathers Athanasius, Basil and Chrysostom, he asks, called heretics by the heretics themselves?" Father Simon in his "Critical History of the Religions and Customs of the Eastern Nations" (2), mentions a letter which Pantogalos addressed to certain divines at Leyden, in which he repudiates the veneration of the saints, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the worship of the Icons, etc. "We declare, he says, that it is not permissible for one to hold any of the above doctrines, nor any other human doctrine, but only what has been given us by our Lord and His inspired Apostles."

Pantogalos seems to have been a good preacher. Before he was made a bishop, Lucaris sent him as a missionary to preach in the various provinces of his Church. Cyril addressed, on the occasion, a circular letter to all the clergy and other Christian people of all provinces (3), in which he says that when a good doctor is found, it is not meet that he should be confined to one place, but all people should have access to him. And because Pantogalos was a good doctor, "he is now sent to travel in all provinces, East and West, and teach the people the doctrines of the Gospel."

Next comes Nathaniel Conopius, a priest and a follower of Lucaris, to whom we owe an account of the details of the martyrdom of the Patriarch. Conopius too was a Cretan. We find him, after Cyril's death, in Oxford, a student of Balliol College. John Evelyn mentions him in his Diary (4) as "a fellow-commoner" of his. He refers to him as the student who came "from Cyril, the Patriarch of Constantinople", and what seems to have impressed Evelyn most in Conopius was that "he was the first I ever saw drink coffee; which custom came not into England till thirty years after." When Conopius left Oxford, he resumed his studies at the Uni-



versity of Leyden. (5) While in Leyden, Conopius expressed the desire of translating Calvin's "Institutiones" into Modern Greek. (6) A. Demetracopoulos (7) says that he did translate them; I failed, however, to discover a copy of that book or a ~~description~~ description of it in any of the authorities on Greek literature of the 17th Century.

We have already mentioned in an earlier chapter Neophytus, the Archbishop of Heracleia, as being a follower of Lucaris, and the same has to be said of Parthenius the Younger (8), who succeeded Cyril, Contari on the Ecumenical Throne. To these must be added Sophronius, bishop of Athens, about whom Lucaris himself was writing to Leger on 10th March 1637: "He is one of my friends, with very good intentions towards the Reformed Religion." (9).

These are the people whom we know to have been influenced by Lucaris' message and to have openly declared themselves to be in favour of his reformation work. To these we should probably have to add a few more, whose names have not come down to us. Even so, however, the number is disappointingly small. So far as the number of avowed followers is concerned, we may say with certainty that Lucaris marked very little success in his work.

In the list of Lucaris' followers we did not include, so far, the name of Maximus Kalliupolites, because he is connected with one particular aspect of Lucaris' work, which must have exercised a deeper and more lasting influence on the Greek people than the above small list of names would suggest. We mean the translation of the New Testament into Modern Greek, which, as we saw in an earlier chapter, was undertaken soon after Leger came to Constantinople. Cyril himself was too busy with his other work, so he entrusted the translation to his

friend Kalliupolites. He was following, however, the progress of the work with great interest, and when the translator died, while the book was still in the press, he revised the proofs. (10) As it has been stated in an earlier chapter, this first translation of the New Testament, printed by P. Aubert in Geneva, made its appearance in the year in which Lucaris died. In this edition of the New Testament the two texts, the original and the translation, are printed in parallel columns, with a few references and notes in the margin. And this book more than the few men who are known to have been Lucaris' followers, more even than his "Confessio- is, we believe, Lucaris' lasting contribution to the spiritual life of his country. Considered even from the strictly literary point of view, this version is an extremely interesting piece of work. It is moreover, a monument to the courageous spirit of Lucaris, for it was indeed a daring act on his part to offer to the people the sacred text of the Scriptures in, what was then called, "the vulgar idiom", which was, however, the only idiom understood by the people. In that first edition of the New Testament in Modern Greek the text is preceded by a preface written by Lucaris himself. In this Lucaris says that the Gospel, which the Greek people have now in a language that they can understand, is "heaven's sweet message to us" and the duty of all christians is to get acquainted with the contents of this message, and there is no other way for one to learn about God's provision for man, but the reading of the Bible. He then deals very severely with the people who forbid the people to read the Scriptures, as well as with those who do not favour the translation of the original text. "If we read and we do not understand, it is the same as if we threw our words to the winds." Now, when the Greek people have the New Testament in an idiom which they can understand, it is their duty to read it.

"Read it, therefore, that you may get the benefit out of it, and pray for those who gave it to you, and may God always lead you into the good. Amen."

The advice which Lucaris gave in this preface to his people does not seem to have been given in vain, for we have evidences that this first Modern Greek New Testament helped to increase the interest of the Greek people in the Scriptures. Forty years after the death of Lucaris, Paul Ricaut, formerly English Consul in Smyrna, was stating (II) that the Scriptures were read in the Churches "in the Vulgar Tongue". Ricaut, it should be noted, is by no means a sympathizer of Lucaris and he strongly disapproves of this reading of the Scriptures "in the Vulgar Tongue". Therefore his testimony is all the more valuable. How widespread this practice of having the Scriptures read in public worship in the translation provided by Lucaris was in Ricaut's time, and how long it lasted - for it died out eventually - we do not have the means of knowing. So long as it lasted, however, it certainly<sup>1</sup> was an influence for good.

That is as far as one can trace the influence of Lucaris' work among the Greek People. One should be careful not to minimize Lucaris' work. Such as it was, it was good. When placed, however, alongside with the work of the Reformers of the 16th Century in other countries, it is, one has to admit, small and insignificant. And one is urged to enquire into the reasons for this.

The Reformation Movement of the 16th Century was not a fact which leaped into being, unheralded and unprepared. It was a complex movement and many forces were at work, preparing the way for it, long

before that made its appearance in history. We can distinguish at least four main factors, which were in operation in the West, and each one of which made its contribution to the preparation of that religious upheaval, which we call Reformation. They are the political, the social, the intellectual and the religious factors. And all four were either entirely or almost non-existent in the Greek East, when Lucaris appeared on the scene of public life.

In connection with the political factor, we have to mention the rise of the national State, which took place before the time of the Reformation, and which made it possible for the sovereigns of various states in Europe, who were not actually interested in the movement, to give it their support, for, as it has been said, "there was no assistance so much desired....in their disputes with the Popes, as that of a spiritual opposition to their decrees." (12)

Such a state of things did not exist in the Greek East previous to, or during the time when Lucaris began his work in the Greek Church. The only political influence which can be mentioned as having had any bearing on Lucaris' work, was the antagonism between England and Holland, on the one hand, and France, on the other, in the Near East, which is, in some measure responsible for the protection given to Lucaris by the ambassadors of the two Protestant countries.

Besides the political, there was operating in the West, before the actual appearance of the Reformation Movement, the social factor. The "Bundschuh", a strongly anti-clerical movement in Germany, is only one instance of various other similar movements, which broke up in various countries in the West, and which had as their aim to vindicate the rights of the people, as against the oppression of the clergy. It was the activities of the "Bundschuh" in Germany in those times, which made that



country, as ~~it~~ has been said, "the most favourable place that Luther could have chosen for his birth." (13).

Such a social movement did not, and probably could not, rise, or, at any rate, make itself felt in the Greek East in the time of Lucaris. ~~At~~ At that time the nation ~~was~~ in a state of slavery, and the Church was not only an Ecclesiastical authority, but also the only national authority which that nation in bondage could have. It was, therefore, against the national interests of the Greeks at that time that they should rise against the oppression of their clergy.

To speak, however, of the oppression of the clergy in connection ~~with~~ with the Greek Church of that time is somewhat misleading. The Greek clergy had by no means developed into the same power, which in the West was exercising so vast an influence in the life of the people. So far from exercising an unduly oppressive influence, the chief complaint, which could be brought against the clergy of the Greek Church at that time, is that it exercised no influence whatever, for lack of an elementary education among the majority of its members. And this brings us to the third factor - the intellectual.

It is a bitter irony to know that the country which probably made the greatest contribution to this factor was herself bereft of its fruits. It was the Greek scholars who, after the Fall of Constantinople, came to the West, bringing with them the precious texts of the classical authors, who had the largest share in initiating the movement of the Renaissance. This movement, with the impetus which it gave to the study of the Scriptures in the original languages, and with the spirit which it cultured of reaction from the rule of tradition that had firmly imposed itself upon the life of the Church, was the first shock which the edifice of the Church of Rome received before the actual earthquake of the Reformation came upon it. And when the discovery of the art of printing made it possible for the knowledge possessed so far by the few to be communicated to the multitudes, the minds of the masses of the



people were prepared to listen to and receive the message of the Reformation.

Such was the state of things in the West, from the point of view of the intellectual life of the people. And it was a picture of absolute contrast that which the Greek East had to offer. Since the Fall of Constantinople Greece had suffered a double bleeding: the exodus of her scholars to the lands of the West and the terrible system of "child-gathering", which was systematically and ruthlessly enforced by the Turks. And the effects of that double bleeding were only too visible in the intellectual life of the people. It may not be an exaggeration to say that Greece never knew a more sterile period in her history than the time when the Renaissance and, later, the Reformation were stirring the lands of the West into a new life.

And lastly, the religious factor has to be considered. Before the coming of Luther and the other Reformers, various religious movements were already in operation preparing the ground. In Germany and England, in France and Italy the message of the Reformation had been taught to the people, long before the Reformers appeared. As it has been well said, "The people was waiting for its prophet, and when the prophet appeared....he found a generation ready to respond and rally to his side." (14) In the country of the chief of the Reformers the "Friends of God", on the one hand, and the "Brethren of the Common Life", on the other, had prepared considerably the minds of the people, by means of their preaching and of the religious literature which they produced and scattered abroad. To what extent Luther was a debtor to the "Friends of God" can be seen in the preface which he supplied to the second edition of the famous "Theologia Germanica" - the masterpiece of that movement, which appeared before Luther was born - and in which he says: "I will say, though it be boastful of myself, and I speak as a fool, that next to the Bible and St. Augustine, no book

hath ever come into my hands, whence I learned or would wish to learn more of what God and Christ and man and all things are."

In the same time the Lollards were waking up the people in England and Scotland. And so much was the impact of their preaching felt by the official Church that the Archbishop of Canterbury was complaining to the Bishop of London that "certain unauthorized persons are setting forth erroneous, yea, heretical assertions in public sermons," and in Scotland the obligation was imposed, in 1416, on all masters of the University of St. Andrews to defend the Church against the attacks of the Lollards to the utmost of their power. (15)

In France and Italy, as early as in the 12th century, movements of antagonism to the Church and of a positively spiritual content appeared in the form of the "Poor Men of Lyons" and of the "Cathari". And how much these movements were felt to be a danger to the existing ecclesiastical system is evidenced by the persecutions which they suffered from the 13th to the end of the 15th century.

It was about the time that preceded the Reformation that preaching revived in the West. Preachers were provided with preaching material, such as the "Biblia Pauperum", the "Postilla" and others. Such was the place that preaching was now gaining in the conscience of the Church, that some distinguished churchmen used to say that preaching was even more important than saying Mass. (16) And it was about the same time that the Scriptures had appeared in the vernaculars of most countries of Western Europe, and with the help of the printing press were finding their way to the hands of the people. No less than fourteen versions of the whole Bible had been printed in the High-German and three in the Low-German, before Luther produced his own translation.

All these factors of religious awakening, which paved the way in the West for the coming of the Reformation, were undreamt of in the Greek

East. As it has been stated in an earlier chapter, preaching had for so long been dead as a part of the church ritual, that the pulpit, even as a piece of furniture, had disappeared in Lucaris' time. And the first New Testament in the vernacular of the people did not make its appearance until the year of the death of the Patriarch.

When the absence in Greece of all these factors, as powers preparing the ground for the work of the Reformation, is considered, it will not be a matter of surprise that the work of Cyril Lucaris did not mark a large measure of success. In a sense, Lucaris was a man born before his time. He came to work in a field which had not undergone the least preparation. Lucaris, therefore, cannot, in the strict sense of the term, <sup>be</sup> called a Reformer. But he was a fore-runner to the Reformation movement among his people and his was the first important stone to be placed in the edifice of the religious life of Modern Greece.

. . . . .

Footnotes to Chapter I3.

. . . . .

- (I) Legrand, *op. cit.* IV, 432-448.
- (2) English Translation by A. Lovell, I685, I83.
- (3) Legrand, *op. cit.* IV, 505-506.
- (4) "The Diary of John Evelyn, F.R.S.", Ed. Wm. Bray, 7. See also Henry Savage, "Balliofergus, or a Commentary on the Foundation etc. of Balliol College", I668, I2I, and Anthony Wood, "Athenae Oxonienses", I72I, Vol. II, col. II40.
- (5) "Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae," La Haye, I875, coll. 359.
- (6) L. Allatius, *op. cit.* Lib. III, Cap. VIII, I020-I02I; Father Simon, *op. cit.* 52.
- (7) "Corrections to Sathas' Modern Greek Literature", 68.
- (8) Smith, *op. cit.* 62.
- (9) Aymon, *op. cit.* II5-II9.
- (I0) Christian Sepp, "Bibliographische Medeeelingen", Leyden I883, I88-256.
- (II) "The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches", London, I679, I5-I6.
- (I2) Ranke, "History of the Popes in the I6th and the I7th Centuries", Vol. I, 64-66.
- (I3) R.B.Lloyd, "The Approach to the Reformation", I76.
- (I4) J. Mackinnon, "The Origins of the Reformation", 4I7.
- (I5) J. Mackinnon, *op. cit.* I29-I39 *passim*.

(I6) T.M.Lindsay, "History of the Reformation", Vol. I, II7-II8.

. . . . .



B I B L I O G R A P H Y

. . . .

I. Correspondence of Lucaris and other people connected with  
his story and other contemporary sources.

1. E. Legrand, "Bibliographie Hellenique du XVIIeme Siecle", Vol. IV.
2. J. Aymon, "Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs," 1708.
3. T. Smith, "Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucari", 1707.
4. Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus", Paris 1740.
5. R. Simon, "La Creance de l' Eglise Orientale...ou l'on fait voir que  
Cyrille Lucar a ete un Imposteur", 1687.
6. Leo Allatius, "De Ecclesiae Occidentalis atque Orientalis Perpetua  
Consensione. Libri Tres. Coloniae, 1648.
7. Pauli Colimesii Rupelensis, "Epistolae Clarorum Virorum", appended to  
his Epistles of Clement of Rome.
8. Comneni Papadopoli, "Historia Gymnasii Patavini".
9. Philippi Cyprii, Protonotarii Constantinopolitani, "Chronicon Ecclesiae  
Graecae." Franquerae, 1679.
10. Evdoxiu de Hurmuzaki, "Documente Privitoare la Istoria Romanilor",  
Bucarest, 1882.
- II. J. Hoffmann, "Patriarche Kyrillos Lucaris", in "Orientalia Christiana",  
Rome, 1929.

- I2. Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, "History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem", 1715.
- I3. A. Leger, "Fragmentum Vitae", in T. Smith's "Collegitanea" as above.
- I4. Sir Th. Roe, "Negotiations in my Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, 1621-1628", London, 1740.

II. Historical Background, especially in connection with the state of the Greek nation and the Greek church under the Turks.

- I. M. Crusius, "Turcograecia".
2. P. Rycaut, "The Present State of the Ottoman Empire".
3. P. Rycaut, "The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches", London, 1679.
4. Ph. de la Croix, "Etat Present des nations et eglises grecque, armenienne et maronite en Turquie". 1715.
5. Ph. de la Croix, "La Turquie Chretienne sous la puissante protection de Louis le Grand". 1695.
6. G. Sandys, "A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610", London 1627.
7. "The Diary of Master Dallam, 1599-1600" published in the Volume of the Hakluyt Society, London, for the year 1893.
8. Christophorus Angelus, "Status et Ritus Ecclesiae Graecae", Francofurti, MDCLV.
9. R. Simon, "The Critical History of the Religions and Customs of the Eastern Nations".
10. A. P. Kerameus, "Greek Texts useful for the study of the History of

Rumania".

- II. P. Zottos, "Les Jesuites a Constantinople pendant le XVII Siecle" in  
"L' Union Chretienne, 1868, 82-96.
- I2. Von Hammer, "Histoire de l' Empire Ottoman".
- I3. L. Ranke, "The Ottoman Empire".
- I4. G. Finlay, "History of Greece."
- I5. L. Ranke, "History of the Popes in the 16th and the 17th Centuries".
- I6. Baudier, "Inventaire de l' Histoire Generale des Turcs."

### III. The "Confessio".

- I. Cyril Lucaris, "Confessio Christianae Fidei", Latin, 1629.
- 2. Idem. "Confessio Christianae Fidei", Greek and Latin,  
Geneva, 1633.
- 3. Cyril Lucaris, "Confession of Faith", English and Latin, London 1629.
- 4. Idem. "Confession of Faith", In French, Sedan, 1629.
- 5. W. Rait, "A Vindication of the Reformed Religion....", Aberdene,  
1671.

IV. Criticisms of the "Confessio".

1. J. M. Caryophilus, "Ἀποδοκιμασία καὶ κατάκρίσις τῆς ἐκ' ὀνόματι Κυρίου.... ἑωδύτου ὁμολογίας τῆς πίστεως". 1632
2. Hugo Grotius, "Votum pro Pace Ecclesiae",
3. Andreas Rivetus, "Apologeticus contra Grotii Votum", Irenopoli, 1645.
4. D. Arnauld, "De la Perpetuite de la Foi".
5. A. Demetracopoulos, "Corrections to Sathas' Modern Greek Literature."
6. D. S. Balanos, "The Confession of Cyril Lucaris", Athens. 1906.

V. Modern Works on Cyril Lucaris.

1. M. Rhenieris, "Κύριλλος Λούκαρις, ὁ Ὁικουμενικὴ Πατριάρχης". 1859.
2. L. Haureau, "Singularites Historiques et literaires", Paris, 1861.
3. Alfred Metetal, "Etudes Historiques sur le Patriarche Cyrille Lucar",  
Strasbourg, 1869.
4. A. Demetracopoulos, "Προσθήκαι καὶ διορθώσεις εἰς Νεοελλ.  
Φιλολογίαν Σάθα". Λειψζίχ, 1873.
5. Paul Trivier, "Un Patriarche de Constantinople au 17eme siecle",  
Paris, 1887.
6. Mihalcesco, "Les idees Calvinistes du Patriarche Cyrille Lucaris" in  
"Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse", Nov.-Dec. 1931.
7. Semnoz, "Les dernieres annees de Cyrille Lucar", in "Echos d' Orient",  
Vol. VI. 1903, 97-107.
8. C. Sathas, "Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία".
9. Alphonse Quepin, "Un apotre de l' Union des Eglises au XVII Siecle,"

- 10. Von Pastor, "History of the Popes".
- 11. A. Diamantopoulos, "Cyril Lucaris, in the "Tercentenary Celebration Volume", in Greek, Athens, 1938.
- 12. G. Arvanitides, "Cyril Lucaris", in the above volume.
- 13. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, "Cyril Lucaris", Athens,

. . . . .